

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1871.

I.—THE GENUINENESS AND AUTHENTICITY OF
THE GOSPELS.

III.

- A New Life of Jesus.* By DAVID FRIEDRICH STRAUSS. In Two Volumes. Williams and Norgate, London. 1865.
- The Origin of Christianity, and a Commentary to the Acts of the Apostles.* By ISAAC M. WISE. Cincinnati: Bloch & Co. 1868.
- The Life of Jesus.* By ERNEST RÉNAN, Membre De L'institut. Translated by Charles Edwin Wilbour. New York: Carleton. 1864.
- The Witness of History to Christ.* Five Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge. Being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1870. By Rev. F. W. FARRAR, M. A., F. R. S. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1871.
- The Person of Christ: The Miracle of History.* With a Reply to Strauss and Rénan, and a Collection of Testimonies of Unbelievers. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.
- Christianity and Positivism.* A series of Lectures to the Times on Natural Theology and Apologetics. Delivered in New York, Jan. 16 to March 20, 1871, on the "Ely Foundation" of the Union Theological Seminary. By JAMES M'COSH, D. D., LL. D., President of the College of New Jersey, Princeton. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871.
- The Character of Jesus Portrayed.* A Biblical-Essay, with an appendix. By Dr. DANIEL SCHENKEL, Professor of Theology, Heidelberg. Translated from the Third German Edition, with Introduction and Notes, by W. H. Furness, D. D. In two volumes. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1866.

TWO articles of this series have been devoted to the external proofs of the genuineness of the Gospels. The principal historical arguments showing that two of them were the work of Apostles and personal disciples of our Lord, and the other two the

work of intimate companions of Apostles, have been exhibited. Other testimony, less weighty, could have been gleaned from the field of Christian antiquity, and that presented could have been illustrated in other ways and combined in other forms; but it is confidently believed that we have shown that the four Gospels of the present canon were received by the widely-spread Christian community, in the last decades of the first century, as genuine and authentic documents.

If success has rewarded our efforts, then it ought not to be difficult to prove the authenticity of the Gospels. An indestructible historical basis for our supernatural religion has been discovered. Evidently we can not suppose that the authors of the books, if they were the men to whom they have been imputed, were dishonest, and, therefore, untrustworthy. That supposition would involve the monstrous absurdity of supposing that men of clear perception, sober judgment, apparent candor, and real moral elevation—engaged in inculcating the noblest sentiments of morality and religion—put their work in jeopardy, exposed themselves to the contempt and persecution of unbelievers and enemies, and at last brought down upon themselves death, by persisting in testifying to supernatural occurrences having no basis in fact. The time was when the hypothesis of imposture was resorted to, but it seems at last to have been abandoned. It is now the fashion to deny the apostolic origin of the Gospels altogether, or to say that such apostolic material as they contain is covered over by subsequent growths of myth and fable. Hence the charge that the Gospels, in their present form, appear only with the close of the second century.

Authenticity, then, follows genuineness. Even Mr. Froude says: "If, as English commentators confidently tell us, the Gospel of St. Matthew, such as we now possess it, is undoubtedly the work of the publican who followed our Lord from the receipt of custom, and remained with him to be a witness of his ascension; if St. John's was written by the beloved disciple who lay on Jesus' breast at supper; if the other two were indeed the composition of the companions of St. Peter and St. Paul; if in these four Gospels we have independent accounts of our Lord's life and passion, mutually confirming each other, and if it can be proved that they existed and were received as authentic in the first century of the Christian Church, a stronger

man than M. Rénan will fail to shake the hold of Christianity in England."* Mr. Froude means, as we understand him, that, these conditions being complied with, the claim of Christianity is made out. The question of the integrity of the text, which we have not yet examined, enters into his hypothetical statement, but, with this exception, we ask whether all that he demands has not been proved.

It is inconceivable that the Gospels are not authentic if they are genuine books. But they may be authentic in all their substantial features even if they are not genuine. As this proposition may be questioned, we devote some space to its proof.

The life of a historic character is written after his work is finished; how long after, depends upon circumstances. Historians rarely write of personal knowledge, and we do not demand more of them than that they shall be discriminating in the choice and arrangement of their materials. As we said in our last article, the Gospels contain nothing in kind, neither miracle, nor teaching, nor command, nor promise, that the Acts, Paul's Epistles, and the Revelation do not take for granted—nothing that is not found in the possession of the Church soon after the middle of the first century. Hence we should not despair of finding a firm historic basis for our faith, even if our four Gospels were not written by their reputed authors. It is sometimes held that the original Gospels were numerous and fragmentary; that they are all lost; and that our present ones are but compilations from them. This hypothesis is not fatal to the truth of our religion. It does not follow from it that our Gospels are worthless. They might be formed out of earlier and less perfect documents, and at the same time be thoroughly trustworthy narratives.

In his notes to Schenkel, Dr. Furness says the origin of the four Gospels "is a question of quite secondary interest, by no means of so vital a character as is commonly supposed." He says further: "Even were we utterly in the dark on this point, had these writings come down to us anonymously, unattended by any evidence whatever as to their dates and authors, it would not be impossible that they might still be true, and the truth might be ascertained with a confidence which no subsequent information we might obtain in regard to their origin and history could increase." Once more: "After all,

* Short Studies on Great Subjects, p. 207.

however interesting this inquiry into the origin and history of the four Gospels may be, it is not, I repeat, a matter of primary importance when or by whom they were written. The evidences of their truth are inwrought into their whole texture. The diamond is a diamond, and may be seen to be a diamond, although we know not when or where it was found." These remarks are suggestive, and they contain much truth. We agree with their author, that the books might be true even if they were anonymous, but he entirely fails to appreciate how the difficulty of making their truth appear would be increased. Yielding the apostolic origin of the Gospels, the argument for their authenticity is conducted at a disadvantage. Dr. Furness apparently does not know how objective minds seek the solid ground of historic reality as a basis for faith—how they cling to definitely ascertained facts.

But it is not the object of this paper to amplify the arguments previously presented, but rather to pursue the second line of inquiry mentioned in the first article of the series. Dr. Furness gives us our point of departure when he says: "The evidences of the Gospels' truth are inwrought into their whole texture." "The diamond is a diamond, and may be seen to be a diamond, although we know not when or where it was found." But before we attempt any statement of internal evidences, we must first illustrate the nature of this method of inquiry, try to estimate its value, and make some strictures upon the work of some of the critics.

The literary productions of different ages and countries, and even of different parts of the same country, have their several characteristics. Ennius did not write the Latin of Horace, nor did Raleigh write the English of Goldsmith. The Roman critics charged Livy with writing the Latin of the Po, and the British were not slow to discover that Sir Walter Scott wrote the English of the Tweed. The foregoing characteristics determine what are called Eras and Schools of Literature. The works of different individuals have likewise their characteristics, and these constitute Style.

But there is another class of internal evidences to the authorship and quality of a literary work. Subject-matter itself is fully as important as diction. Is the narrative, if it be a narrative under consideration, intrinsically consistent and probable? Does it harmonize with what we know from other sources of the same subject?

Does it harmonize with what we know from other sources concerning the age and country which furnished the theater of its action? If the whole history consists of several independent parts, as in the case of the Gospel history, do these harmonize? Or if they conflict, is it on major or on minor points? Is there evidence of sober-mindedness and moral elevation on the part of the writer?

Diction and subject-matter give a basis for conclusions as to the age, authorship, and value of literary works. The late Sir Edmund Head very acutely guessed that the author of "*Vestiges of Creation*," while yet unknown to be Robert Chambers, must be a native of Scotland or Ireland rather than of England, from a single passage in which *shall* was used for *will*.* Examples illustrating the second class of indications as to authenticity and genuineness, will be furnished in abundance as we go on with the discussion. The two classes together determine the province of literary criticism.

The tests of criticism are far more delicate than those of history, and the internal evidences of a book's authenticity and genuineness are generally less satisfactory than historical proofs. The truth is, the marks of an epoch, of a country, or the impress of an individual mind, are not always so unmistakable as to furnish a solid basis for argument. Grievous mistakes have been made, and are still made, by the most acute critics. Criticism is called a science; but its history is peculiarly a history of blunders and failures. In the field of Biblical criticism especially, these have been so numerous—the critics have so crossed and devoured each other—that it seems almost ludicrous to call criticism a science at all. As a science it is pretentious; it promises more than it performs; it often fails to solve problems that its cultivators claim the ability to solve. Nevertheless, it must not be wholly discredited; it has led to many valuable results; and its method of investigation is indispensable to literature. Full illustration of these points is called for.

The critics could not agree upon the author of the "*Waverley Novels*," though he was a well-known poet and prose writer; and the whole matter was in doubt until Sir Walter Scott avowed the authorship. The letters of Junius have furnished a field for many a fierce

* These auxiliaries give foreigners great trouble. The ground of Sir Edmund's conclusion was the well-known fact that the Scotch and Irish are notorious offenders in the use of the two words. We are indebted to "*The Nation*," June 16, 1870, for the illustration.

critical contest, with no definite result, until the recent discovery of some new historical proofs has set the question at rest. Prof. Stowe, in his "Origin and History of the Books of the Bible," furnishes another illustration. "About forty years since, Dr. Wilhelm Meinhold, of the island of Rugen, published his celebrated novel of the 'Amber Witch.' It purported to be a copy of an old manuscript found in a church there, and written by a clergyman of the time of Gustavus Adolphus. Critics who could decide from internal evidence alone that the books of the New Testament could not have been written earlier than the second or third centuries of the Christian Era, were easily deceived by the 'Amber Witch,' and pronounced it a genuine production of the period of the thirty years' war, being two centuries out of the way in both cases."* It is said that dishonest vintners, in order to sell new wine for old, manufacture certain external evidences of age, as mold and cobwebs, but there is a *quality* of the wine that they can not imitate. Dr. Meinhold, however, seems to have counterfeited the very flavor of antiquity.

Biblical criticism abounds with illustrations of the folly of relying too confidently on the tests of critical science. M. De Pressensé very thoughtfully remarks: "The most eminent critics, if guided only by their individual appreciation of texts, and unbiased by any tradition, come to the most various conclusions upon the same passages. One sees in Matthew evident marks of its being the later composition, while another makes the same observation on Mark. They are not less divided when the question is, whether such and such a narrative presents the tokens of originality or not. The conclusion, then, must be, that criticism has no certain test for distinctions so delicate; and we are convinced that such a test it never will possess, and that on this path of critical inquiry the arbitrary reigns unchecked."† He hence concludes that it is absolutely chimerical to pretend to distinguish earlier and later elements in the lives of our Lord.

A school of German writers began, more than half a century ago, with denying the authenticity of the Revelation; they at last conclude that this book is a genuine relic, and possibly the only one, of the very first age of the Christian Church. Bretschneider attacked the authenticity of John, and afterward retracted his doubts. He was a "critic" both in attacking and retracting. Formerly it was

* P. 43.

† *Jesus Christ: His Times, Life and Work*, p. 131.

thought that the fourth Gospel had the best claim of any of the Gospels to apostolic authority; now it is asserted that the contents of the book clearly prove that it could not have been written by John. Strauss differs from the Tübingen school touching this Gospel, and Rénan differs from both. Baur declares that the first Epistle of John is an imitation of it, and Hilgenfeld says the Gospel is an imitation of the Epistle. Baur explains the Gospels on one theory, and Rénan on another, and Strauss on another still. At one time the Apostles are impostors; at another, enthusiasts; and at another, they have nothing to do with the Gospels at all.* Now the Gospels are mythical, and now legendary narratives. Even Strauss writes: "New hypotheses about the three first Gospels, more especially, their sources, objects, authorship, and mutual relation, follow each other so rapidly, and are asserted and attacked with such eagerness, that we almost forget there is any thing else to be considered; and the controversy threatens to be so endless, that we begin to despair of ever arriving at a clear understanding as to the main problem, if its solution is really to be deferred until all these matters have been settled."* He accordingly holds that "the Gospel criticism of the last twenty years has certainly somewhat run to seed"!

Stunned and bewildered by the confusion of this babel, a plain man would be pardonable if he lost his head and asserted that criticism is no science. But the confusion is none the less when we come to collate the dates that the Rationalistic critics have assigned to the Gospels. According to Baur of Tübingen, Matthew was first written between 130 and 134, and Luke not before 150; Zeller thinks Luke was written about 130, Volckmar, 110; Köstlin puts the original draft of Matthew between 70 and 80, its elaboration into its present form, 90 to 100, Luke a little earlier, and Mark a little later; Hilgenfeld puts Matthew and Mark about the end of the first century, and Luke about the beginning of the second. Rénan concedes a higher antiquity to all of the Gospels than most of the negative school of critics are willing to allow.

Contradictions come within the sphere of the critic's activity, and perhaps no single feature of the Gospels has been treated with so much unfairness as the contradictions, real or apparent, that occur

* Preface to "New Life," p. xi.

in them. Strauss published his "Life of Jesus" in 1835. It is a marvel of patient labor and ingenious, though fallacious, reasoning. It rests upon two propositions, of which this is the first: "An account which lays claim to any historical value must not be inconsistent with itself, nor contradict other accounts." This proposition is true enough if properly limited and qualified, but this is what it does not get at the hands of Strauss. Such questions as these occur: Are the contradictions incidental or principal? Do the two accounts utterly destroy each other? or does one simply exclude the other? or may they both, though conflicting in some points, be substantially true? These are important questions, and they are quite overlooked by the Rationalistic critics. They do not discriminate between essential contradictions and unimportant differences. It is no part of our purpose to discuss the question at length; we are quite willing to concede that the discrepancies of the Gospels put their verbal inspiration out of the question; but that they destroy or weaken their historical character, we deny altogether.

The work of Mr. Wise, who is at once a Jewish Rabbi and a Rationalist, furnishes an illustration in point. We must premise that the Rabbi maintains that "the four Gospels can not be taken as the main sources for the origin of Christianity"; also that the historians of the resurrection of Jesus did not intend, in their accounts of that transaction, to state facts, but "to chronicle legendary narratives as such, as they had received them"; also that Luke "had not the intention to chronicle facts in the first chapter of Acts, but only to relate the traditions that had come down to him."

The author of Luke and the Acts "flatly denies," says Mr. Wise, "that the disciples went to Galilee after the death of Jesus, whatever Matthew and John may maintain to the contrary." The different accounts of the time spent by Jesus on earth after his resurrection, do indeed involve some difficulties, but none that are insurmountable. But Luke does *not* "flatly deny" that the disciples went to Galilee during that time; he does not mention their going; he may or may not have known it; all that can be affirmed is, he is silent concerning it. If silence on the part of one historian is to be construed as a contradiction of what another says, what is to become of history? The example is given as a specimen of the kind of "criticism" in which some writers indulge.

Criticism has created the school of *a priori* historians—a school of writers who, where it suits their convenience, ignore the facts that show how things *were*, and presume to tell us how they *must have been*; who attempt to evolve history, as Coleridge's German evolved the camel, out of consciousness. The historian is entitled to his theories, but they must be deductions from the facts, not preconceived categories of thought, that allow him to accept or reject facts at his pleasure. Even *doctrinaire* Guizot says: "Nothing tortures history more than logic. No sooner does the human mind seize upon an idea, than it draws from it all its possible consequences; makes it produce, in imagination, all that it would in reality be capable of producing, and then figures it down in history with all the extravagant additions which itself has conjured up. This, however, is nothing like the truth. Events are not so prompt in their consequences as the human mind in its deductions." If the human mind thus tortures history, in reasoning from an idea which history has suggested, or a fact that it has furnished, how much more violently does it torture it when the idea is a philosophical conceit, not only destitute of all historic basis, but opposed to unexceptionable testimony!

What has been said in the last paragraph concerning the subjective historians, will stand out in clearer light if accompanied by an account of their work. Rabbi Wise shall furnish two illustrations.

In his criticism upon the first chapter of Acts, he says: "Peter could not possibly say to his contemporaries 'and it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem'; nor could he say the field was called, 'in their proper tongue, Aceldama,' which he must translate for them 'the field of blood,' if he addressed the eye-witnesses of that event in the city of Jerusalem, whose language was familiar to them." In reply to the first point, it may be said, first, it was not unnatural that Peter, speaking some time after the tragedy of Judas's death, should say "it *was* known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem"; and, second, it is conceivable that Peter may have said, "*is* known," and that Luke changed the tense of the verb. To the second point it may be replied, Granting that Peter would not be likely to use the expressions, "in their proper tongue," and "that is to say, the field of blood," there is nothing violent in the supposition that Luke, writing for an audience very different from Peter's, may have added

those phrases in order to make what Peter did say intelligible to his readers. This is simply saying that we have here a trace of indirect quotation, accompanied by a comment of the reporter's. The writings of the classic historians, as Xenophon's, abound in similar examples of reporting. This is a fact well known to all classical scholars, but no man of sense pretends that the authenticity of the history is invalidated thereby.

Once more the Rabbi: "The prayer which Luke records on this occasion, [the election of an Apostle to take the place of Judas,] can not be authentic; it is certainly his own composition. The words in verse 25, 'That he may take part of this ministry and apostleship,' like the word 'bishopric' in verse 20, can not be supposed to have been uttered at so early a stage of the Apostolic history, before the existence of any Episcopacy. They point distinctly to a time when the Church had already an Episcopalian organization, with ministers or deacons, apostles and bishoprics, or episcopacies." Hence, Luke is charged with having "added a prayer, and put it in the mouths of the eleven Apostles"! It is sufficient to reply that the word here rendered "bishopric," is found in the corresponding passage of the Septuagint; that its use does not imply the existence of the elaborate episcopal organization of two centuries later, since words grow with the growth of that which they signify; and that Peter and the other Apostles must have had some ideas of a "ministry" and an "Apostleship," since Jesus had often discoursed on these topics, though it is not probable that they comprehended the depth and fullness of the terms as they did a few years later. We fail to see any thing in the nature of the human mind, or in the circumstances then present, or in the state of mind of the Apostles, that makes it improbable that Peter would quote the passage containing the word "bishopric" from the Psalms, or that the eleven would make the prayer recorded, any time between the ascension of Christ and the succeeding Pentecost.

But Strauss has distinguished himself beyond most of his competitors as a writer of *a priori* history. He has very appropriately been called "the Coryphæus" of modern unbelief. His second proposition is this: "An account is not historic, when it is irreconcilable with known and universal laws which govern the course of events." He means by this, that every narrative of miracles is

unhistoric. In his "New Life," published in 1864, and intended for the common reader, as the earlier work was for the learned, Strauss adheres to this canon. "In the person and acts of Jesus no supernaturalism should be suffered to remain." "We can clearly perceive this, that no single Gospel, nor all the Gospels together, can claim that degree of historical reliability which would be required in order to make us debase our reason to the point of believing miracles." Rénan holds similar language.

Strauss does not banish the supernatural from the life of Jesus, it must be noticed, because he has found the Gospels historically untrustworthy—because he has cross-examined the witnesses and found them false; but because miracles are contrary to the philosophical categories which he has learned in the school of Hegel. His proposition is not the result of historical inquiry; it is the philosophical canon that is to guide in making the inquiry. It will at once be seen that, starting with the dogma that no kind or amount of testimony shall be allowed to establish a given class of facts, you can make of history any thing you please.

But how does Strauss get his canon? How does he prove his second proposition? He falls back upon the famous argument of Hume, whom one of the ablest of the whole Naturalistic school calls the acutest thinker of the eighteenth century. In different hands this argument has assumed different forms, but it has never lost its identity; it is David Hume's argument on miracles still. Strauss refers to it as having, "for a certain class of writers, settled the question of the miraculous." It runs thus: Miracles must be rejected because they are contrary to universal experience. "In the name of constant experience," says M. Rénan, "we banish miracles from history." But how do these writers know that miracles are contrary to universal experience? Whether they are or are not, is the very question in controversy, and there is no way of settling it but to appeal to testimony. To say that they are contrary to the experience of men now living, proves nothing; to say they are contrary to universal experience—to the experience of the contemporaries of Christ and the Apostles, for instance—is to assume the question in debate. The inquiry, then, is historical; the question is, *Have there been miracles?* not, *Can there be?* and the subject can not be settled on philosophical principles. That so transparent a fallacy as Hume's

should have imposed on able men, is astonishing; for, verily, sophist never ran round a smaller circle, or was guilty of a more palpable *petitio principii*.

But if the Naturalist has no right to commence the investigation with a principle that renders the proof of the miraculous in Christ and the supernatural in history impossible, neither has the Supernaturalist the right to commence it with an affirmation of their presence. Possibly it can be proved on *a priori* grounds, that God would not be apt to give His children over to the dominion of an inexorable natural order; that He would be likely miraculously to manifest Himself in history; but in the present case we ask nothing more than that the supernatural shall not be ruled out in advance by the arbitrary canons of a negative criticism. We do not object to discussing the miraculous—God's relation to natural law—on the grounds of philosophy; on this field the Naturalist boasts no victories over the Supernaturalist; but all we contend for when the Gospels are made the subject of historical criticism, is that the miracles come within the field of historical investigation. Only concede, as Mr. Froude concedes, that "the question about miracles is one of evidence," and we are satisfied.

But if there were, as Strauss insists, nothing supernatural in the person and deeds of Christ—if the Great Founder did not rise above the level of the natural—how came his accredited biographies to be full of miracle? Denying the presence of miracle in His life, how is its presence in the Gospels to be explained? This is what Strauss attempts to tell us, but before we attend to his answer, we must remark that his work is in no proper sense, even in form, a life of Jesus. He demolishes, but does not construct. He pronounces dogmatically that Jesus was *not* this, was *not* that—did *not* do this, did *not* do that; but concerning what He *was*, and what He *did*, we are left in the most painful uncertainty. Here Strauss falls immeasurably below Rénan. The Frenchman gives us a definite though false idea of the author of Christianity, but the German seems to have no clear or definite conceptions himself. All is vague and shadowy. The image of Jesus, so long and so fondly cherished by Christians, is destroyed as illusory, and nothing substantive is put in its place. No man can fully appreciate the appropriateness of the designation "Negative Criticism," bestowed upon this school, until

he has followed Strauss over his wearisome pages. But it is time we should attend to the manner in which the supernatural found its way into the Gospels.

Strauss offers "the idea of the myth as the key to the miraculous narratives of the Gospel, and much else that in the accounts of the Gospels is opposed to an historical view." What he means by myth, shall be explained in his own words:

"It is in vain I said, [he refers to his previous work,] in the cases of stories like that about the star of the wise men, about the transfiguration, about the miraculous feeding, and the like, to attempt to make them conceivable as natural events; but as it is quite as impossible to imagine things so unnatural to have really happened, all narratives of this kind must be considered as fictions. If it were asked how, at the period to which the appearance of our Gospels is to be assigned, men came to invent such fictions about Jesus, I pointed above all to the expectations of the Messiah current at that time. When men, I said, first a few persons, then a continually increasing number, had come to see the Messiah in Jesus, they supposed that every thing must have coincided in him, which, according to the Old Testament prophecies and types, and their current interpretations, was expected of the Messiah. However notorious throughout the country it might be that Jesus was from Nazareth, still, as the Messiah, as the son of David, he must have been born in Bethlehem, for Micah had so prophesied. Jesus might have uttered words of severe reproach against the desire for miracles on the part of his countrymen, and those words might still be living in tradition; but Moses, the first deliverer of the people, had worked miracles, therefore the last Deliverer, the Messiah, and Jesus had of course been he, must likewise have worked miracles. Isaiah had prophesied that at that time, *i. e.*, the time of the Messiah, the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall hear; then will the lame man leap like a deer, and the tongue of the stammerer speak flowingly; thus it was known in detail what sort of miracles Jesus, having been the Messiah, must have performed. And so it happened that in the earliest Church narratives might, nay, could not fail to be invented, without any consciousness of invention on the part of the authors of them."*

Dr. Schaff reduces this theory to the form of a syllogism, thus:

"There was a fixed idea in the Jewish mind, nourished by the Old Testament writings, that the Messiah would perform certain miracles—heal the sick, raise the dead, etc.; there was a fixed persuasion in the minds of the disciples of Jesus that he actually was the promised Messiah: therefore, the mytho-poetic faculty instinctively invented the miracles corresponding to the Messianic conception, and ascribed them to him."†

But "not all the Evangelical narratives which are to be considered as myths, have this origin but the Christian Church and its

* *A New Life of Jesus*, pp. 201-2.

† *The Person of Christ*, pp. 155-6.

most ancient writers have also new ideas and experiences, though preferring the support of these Old Testament antitypes, looked at as mythical histories."* How this second class of myths came to spring up, will in a moment be explained; but here we must note the fact that Strauss does not impute intentional deception to the authors of the mythical narratives. He discovers some trace of falsehood in the Gospels, especially in John's, but most of the myths were unconsciously invented. The "myth in its original form," says he, "is not the conscious and intentional invention of an individual, but a production of the common consciousness of a people or religious circle, which an individual does indeed first enunciate, but which meets with belief for the very reason that such individual is but the organ of this universal conviction. It is not a covering in which a clever man clothes an idea which arises in him, for the use and benefit of the ignorant multitude, but it is only simultaneously with the narrative, nay, in the very form of the narrative which he tells that he becomes conscious of the idea which he is not yet able to apprehend purely as such."†

The man who is not saturated with German mysticism may be at a loss to understand how men of any pretensions to common sense, could persuade themselves that Jesus, whose birthplace was well known to be Nazareth, was born in Bethlehem, simply because the National Deliverer was to be born there; or how the same men, having the best opportunities to know the contrary, could make themselves believe that Jesus worked miracles for no other reason than that the Messiah was expected to work them. Strauss perceives the difficulty, as appears in the following extract:

"But the more the Evangelical myths appear to have been, in part at least, newly and independently formed, the more difficult becomes the possibility of conceiving how the authors of narratives of this sort could have been unconscious that they were recounting as having happened, something that had not really happened, but had been invented by them."‡

Strauss not only perceives the difficulty, but he seeks to remove it by showing how the second class of myths originated:

"He who first gave the account of the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, might do so in good faith, for according to Micah, the Messiah was to come from Bethlehem;

* New Life, p. 205.

† New Life, p. 206.

‡ New Life, Vol. I, p. 206.

and Jesus had been the Messiah, consequently must have been born in Bethlehem. He, on the contrary, who first told that on the decease of Jesus the curtain in the Temple was rent in twain, (Matt. xxvii, 51,) must have known it would appear that he had neither seen this happen nor heard it from any one, but that he had invented it himself. But in this very instance an allegorical form of speech, such as we find in Heb. x, 19, ff., to the effect that the death of Jesus opened the way for us through the curtain into the Holy of Holies, might have been easily understood by a hearer in a literal sense, and thus that story have arisen entirely without consciousness of invention. In like manner the calling of the four disciples to be fishers of men, may sometimes have been told in such a manner that the take of fish to which Jesus called them was contrasted with their earlier trade and its scanty profit, as being immeasurably more advantageous, and it is self-evident how easily, in the circulation of the story from mouth to mouth, the history of the miraculous draft of fishes (Luke v) might hence arise. So also the accounts intended for the verification of the resurrection of Jesus have, at first sight, the appearance of being necessarily either historical or conscious falsehoods; and yet any one who identifies himself with the circumstances, will see that it is not so. In the dispute upon this point, a Jew may have said: 'No wonder that the sepulchre was found empty, for of course you have stolen the body away.' 'We stolen it away!' said the Christian; 'how could we have done that when you had certainly set a watch over it? He believed this, because he assumed it. Another Christian, telling the story after him, said still more decisively that the sepulchre had been watched, and the seal placed upon it was found in Daniel, whose den of lions naturally presented itself as an antitype of the sepulchre of Jesus, in which death could as little get the mastery over him, as the beasts in the den over Daniel. Or a Jew said: 'Yes, he may have appeared to you, but as a disembodied spirit from the lower world.' 'As a disembodied spirit!' answered the Christian; 'nay, but he had (this was a matter of course to the Christians,) and moreover showed us, the marks of the nails from his crucifixion.' The next who told the story might understand that the showing involved also the allowing them to be felt, and thus narratives of this kind were formed quite in good faith, but still with no pretensions to be history."*

That Jesus arose from the dead, was a doctrine of the early Church. How this absurd belief originated, we are told in the following extracts:

"The Jewish conceptions of the Messiah, though different in different persons, agreed, nevertheless, in this, that the Messiah, after the opening of his Kingdom, would continue to reign over his followers for a period far exceeding the natural duration of life. . . . If he died at last, this death was to happen to all life on earth, for the purpose of bringing about the change into the supernatural state; in no case could he die until he had finished his work and executed all that was expected of him; in no case as one submitting to superior power, or a condemned criminal."†

These Messianic conceptions were shared by the disciples of Jesus. Now, as a matter of fact, both had occurred—that is, Jesus

* New Life, Vol. I, pp. 206-8.

† Vol. I, p. 422.

had died before his work was finished, and died a criminal—"his ministry as the Messiah had been broken off by the violence practiced against him by the Jews, even before it had fully begun."* Hence the idea generated the myth; the disciples believed that Jesus had arisen from the dead because in no other way could they reconcile their belief that he was the Messiah with their conception of the duration of the Messiah's reign! His ministry had been interrupted, but only apparently; "the people to whom he had been sent had shown themselves unworthy to keep him, and to partake of the blessings he had wished to bring them. Therefore the heavens at length had taken him up until the people should become worthy of his being sent again by God, that the times of restitution long since promised to the true Israel may come in."†

Strauss's ideas could be illustrated at any length from his own pages. Suffice it to say, Jesus was said to be the son of a virgin because a passage in Isaiah was misconstrued; he was represented as feeding the multitudes miraculously because Moses had fed the Israelites in the wilderness with manna; and the story of his being found in the Temple engaged in conversation with the doctors originated in an incident in the childhood of the Emperor Augustus recorded by Suetonius! The incident is this: The young Augustus, who had been some time missed, was at last found on the eastern (which was the sacred) summit of the house! Apparently the translator of Strauss's work seriously expects sober-minded Anglo-Saxons to believe that the Preaching of the Cross, that the Christian Faith, that the Historic Church, have no other basis than this!

Henry Ward Beecher somewhere says of the influence and tendency of a certain class of literature: "You might as well draw a sword on a plague, or charge a malaria with the bayonet." Some may think this striking figure applicable in the present case; but we shall risk the charge of committing this folly by offering some strictures on Strauss's theory:

1. He unwarrantably imputes to the authors of the Gospels one of his own mental peculiarities; that is, he imputes to them a mental bias that governs all their conclusions. They are under the dominion of a theological dogma, as he is of a philosophical one. They find miracles in the life of Jesus because they started out (though un-

* Vol. I, p. 422.

† New Life, Vol. I, p. 422.

consciously) to find them; he does not find them because he (though consciously) started with a contrary determination.

2. It has been urged that the first century was not a period favorable to the growth of myth. Dean Millman and others who have studied it thus hold. We do not press the argument. But certainly the circumstances attending the Gospel movement in its infancy were not favorable to the reception of mythical narratives concerning Jesus. There were those, both among the Jews and Pagans, who had the means of knowing the facts. Besides, Strauss imputes the creation of the myths to a small part of the Christian community; the great mass of the early Christians never believed them. How, then, did it happen that the few shaped the Christian faith rather than the many? How did they with their myths entirely supplant their brethren who had the truth? But there is not the slightest evidence to show that the miracles of Jesus were ever denied or questioned in Christian antiquity. On the other hand there is the best evidence to show that they were conceded. Strauss indeed holds that the Gospels in their present form belong to the latter part of the second century; but since he grants that most of the myths originated before the fall of Jerusalem, the age of the Gospels is not material to the argument. According to his own chronology these myths made their way in the presence of multitudes, both in and out of the Church, who knew they were fabrications.

3. The superstructure of Strauss's theory is composed of the material out of which he should have made the foundation. The inventors of the myths believed that Jesus worked miracles because they believed him to be the Messiah, who was to work them. Their faith in *them* was the result of their faith in *him*. Peter and John, James and Paul—men who do not seem to have been simpletons—believed that Jesus was supernatural because they believed him to be the Messiah; but how they came to accept him as the Messiah *Mynheer* Strauss does not explain. Strauss himself says miracles were to be the commission of the Messiah. Such an expectation is the major premise of his syllogism; it is therefore inconceivable that Jesus could have been accepted as the Messiah without them. Thus the lofty walls, the high-reared towers, and the elaborately-wrought dome of Strauss's edifice is found to have no foundation.

This argument has been presented in a variety of forms. Dr. Schaff has done it thus felicitously:

"A fundamental error of the mythical hypothesis consists in a radical inversion of the natural order and relation of history and poetry, as it exists in every historical age like that in which Christ made his appearance on earth. Facts give rise to songs, and not *vice versa*. Prophecies, and expectations, too, may foreshadow events, but do not create them. The real object pervades the picture of the artist; the hero, the epic. Bunyan's 'Pilgrim's Progress' presupposes the Christian experience of which it is a beautiful allegory. Milton's 'Paradise Lost' could never have produced the belief in the fall of man, but rests on this belief, and the fact it describes with all the charm and splendor of sanctified genius. All the great revolutions in the world have been effected, not by fictitious personages, but by real living men, whose power corresponded to their influence."*

4. The Jesus of the Gospels is not the Messiah whom the Jews expected. They certainly looked for one—had definite conceptions concerning him, and the disciples shared them with their countrymen; but who shall say Jesus is, in any leading characteristic, a reflection of these conceptions? He is not an incarnation of the ideas of his age. In his second lecture, Mr. Farrar elaborates this argument thus forcibly:

"As a Teacher, the bearing of Christ was in violent contrast with that of the stately priests and scrupulous Pharisees, who possessed the unbounded confidence of the people, but on whose guilty heads he kindled the scathing flame of his tenfold malediction. As a Prophet, He claimed the credentials of miracles, which, in others of the very greatest prophets, had been considered superfluous, and He refused the very miracles which were demanded at his hands. As a Messiah, He reversed and violated the most cherished expectations of His land and age. In the *Memorabilia* of Xenophon, in the *Eclogues* of Virgil, we may see the type of deliverer for whom the Gentiles yearned—a philosopher who should resolve all questions, a princely Infant before whom the rocks should flow with honey, and the briers bloom with roses. In Judas the Gaulonite—a man of traditional belief, of dazzling eloquence, of burning patriotism, of undaunted courage—in Barkokebas, an impetuous boaster, a lying sorcerer, and an iron-handed chief, we may see the type of the Messiah for whom the Jews had looked. They expected 'a more victorious Joshua, a more magnificent Herod, a wider-ruling Cæsar, a wiser Moses, a holier Abraham'; not the Nazarene, the carpenter, the crucified; not one in whom the glorious passion of their poet-prophets became a perfect simplicity, and the fire which had burnt before them a lambent flame. The path that 'nobly desired to descend'—the greatness, not of self-assertion, but of self-sacrifice—the light that would not blaze with noonday splendor, but shone quietly in the uncomprehending darkness—the glory that was greater than the glory of Solomon, though it chose not the purple of sovereignty, but the form of a servant—what did they know of

* Person of Christ, pp. 167-8.

these? The idea of one who was crowned indeed, but only with a crown of thorns—uplifted, but only on the throne of the accursed tree—exalted, but only by a sinless innocence—the idea of one who blessed the world with arms outstretched upon the cross—was created solely by the living fact; and He in whom it was realized, so far from being formed by popular conceptions or secular tendencies, won for himself, during his life-time, only a mere handful of obscure and timid followers, and perished under the banded obloquies of the nations and of His age.”*

5. Granting, for sake of argument, that there are mythical elements in the Gospels, the theory that they were unconscious inventions utterly breaks down. The men who testified to the miracles of Jesus must have known whether he worked them or not. They could not have been the deluded victims of their own prepossessions, which prepossessions, as we have seen, could not have been formed independently of the miracles. The men who first preached the Gospel—who planted deep and strong the foundations of the historic Church—who left behind them imperishable monuments of their labors—had enough clear perception and sobriety of mind to know what they saw, heard, and handled. They do not talk like mystics. They “speak forth the words of truth and soberness.” Paul says: “This thing was not done in a corner;” he says, too, the Apostles are not men who adulterate, or who traffic in the Word of God.† Peter says: “We have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were eye-witnesses of his majesty.”‡

We would be willing to rest the whole argument on the resurrection. If ever there was a case where deception, and especially self-deception, was out of the question, it was that one; while, if those who held to the resurrection had been exalted to the heights of enthusiasm or mysticism, the persecution to which their testimony exposed them was well calculated to bring them down to the solid ground of fact and reality. Thus the infidel is compelled to face the dreadful dilemma—self-deception or imposture on the part of the witnesses; he shrinks from one horn only to be impaled upon the other.

What these philosophical theories would make of history, the intelligent reader can readily infer. Following Strauss's first canon; that contradictions invalidate testimony, Norton has studied the con-

* *The Witness of History to Christ*, pp. 62-5.

† 2 Cor. ii, 17, and iv, 2.

‡ 2 Peter, i, 16.

flitting accounts of the assassination of Cæsar, and has reached the conclusion that such an event never took place.* Archbishop Whately, reasoning after the manner of Hume, resolved Napoleon into a myth as soon as he was in his grave.† In the same manner Dr. Wurm, a German writer, has taken in hand the documents relating to Martin Luther. He finds one authority saying he was born at Möhra, another, at Eisleben, another, at Mansfield; while some say his conversion was due to a duel, and others to a thunder-storm. The learned Doctor comes to the conclusion, *a la Strauss*, that the history of the great German Reformer is a mythical narrative. The wits have had their sport at the expense of these visionaries. Wurm incidentally shows that Strauss himself is in danger of being resolved by some future critic into a myth; his name, which signifies ostrich, containing the generating idea.

Has it not been shown that much of the so-called "Biblical criticism" is altogether fanciful and absurd? that its authors start with a wrong principle when they essay to tell us what Matthew, Mark, and the rest would and would not say? Prof. Stowe pertinently asks, "Who knows enough of the literature or of the persons of that period and class of writers to decide, for example, that a certain book ascribed to Paul was written by Apollos?" And again: "Who knows any thing, indeed, except from the books themselves, of the mental characteristics of Paul and Apollos?" So long as the critics can not agree among themselves whether there was a Homer, whether the *Iliad* is one original poem, or a patchwork—so long as they can not decide which of the works attributed to Plato are genuine and which spurious—they had better not, in the face of strong historical evidence, assail, on critical grounds, the historic basis of our religion.

There is a sober-minded criticism that leads to valuable results. Upon the strength of positive anachronisms in the structure of a work, or of substantial inconsistencies, or of contradictions with other documents, or upon the strength of other like weighty considerations, such a criticism decides that a work is wholly, or partially, spurious; but it is always careful about setting up its *dicta* in opposition to external evidence. Such a criticism finds an appropriate field when two or more books are attributed to the same author, as

* Internal Evidences, pp. 20-82. † Historic Doubts Relative to Napoleon Bonaparte.

in the case of Luke and John, Peter and Paul; but it hesitates before it adopts as a principle of criticism, the proposition that all the sides of a writer's mind, and all his forms of expression, appear in a single work. It has the foresight to see, (if we may borrow an illustration from Dr. M'Cosh,) that such a principle leads to the conclusion that Shakspeare could not have written those plays which deal with war and stirring incidents, and also have conceived or depicted the reflective and moralizing Hamlet; that Milton could not at once have been the author of the stately, organ-like music of "Paradise Lost," and the livelier strains of "Comus."

But we have reached our limits. We had intended, in this paper, to present some of the more obvious and convincing of the internal evidences of the Gospel's genuineness and truth, but our whole space has been devoted to the discussion of method. We had intended nothing exhaustive. To say nothing of the insufficient space at our disposal, we claim but slender qualification for such a task. There are, however, certain great facts lying upon the surface of the subject, that may be profitably considered in connection with what has already been presented. This work must be postponed to another time.

II.—IS THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT OBLIGATORY UPON US AS CHRISTIANS?

THE question involves the idea of the perpetual obligation of the observance of the Jewish Sabbath, as found in the Decalogue, and elsewhere referred to in the law of Moses. It is an easy matter to give a simple *yea* or *nay* to any question, but not so easy to give the reasons either for the one or the other. The question before us is one of no ordinary importance, and admits of a wide range of inquiry and argument. We wish to look at the more salient points of it in the present essay.

THREE GRAND DIVISIONS OF THE OLD SCRIPTURES.

The three grand divisions of the Old Testament, as given by the Savior, are the "Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms." (Luke xxiv, 44) These are the more general and comprehensive classifications of the Jewish Scriptures. "The law was given by Moses." It was given through him to the chosen tribes at Mt. Sinai. The whole legal dispensation is comprehended under this phrase—"the Law."

MODERN DIVISIONS.

In modern times, several divisions have been given to "the Law," not specified by the Divine Legislator, and unknown in Apostolic times—such as the *moral*, the *ceremonial*, and the *judicial* laws. This distinction, though answering some purposes in the nomenclature of the theologian, has thrown much confusion and doubt in the mind, in the consideration of the subject as found in the Apostolic Scriptures.

The distinction between moral and ceremonial law does not occur for once in the Jewish Scriptures; and what is termed, by way of emphasis, "*the moral law*," is in no way peculiarly identified with the Decalogue. This does not certainly include all moral precepts, even by remote implication, or in the widest construction made of it. No admitted laws of exegesis will enable us to reach any such conclu-

sions in regard to it. No mode of interpretation of Scripture is more fascinating than the "*intuitional method*," that allows one's own "*verifying faculty*" to find any and every thing, as the imagination may lead, in distinct portions of the Word of God. It is such a compliment to the genius and talent of the discoverer, and such proof of the sufficiency of human reason, to ascertain what *ought* to constitute a revelation from God!

The Decalogue, or Ten Commandments of the Law, totally omits many moral precepts and prohibitions—such as beneficence, truth, justice, temperance, control of temper, and others. We are aware that many theologians have found almost every thing in the Ten Commandments, and that all our duties to God and to man are comprehended in it, just as many have found in the text, "Adam, Enoch, and Seth," or the good and the bad figs of Ezekiel, amplest food for the widest speculation in regard both to things human and divine. By such methods, we have no doubt but that the Gospel, and the whole remedial scheme, can be found written on the two tables of the Law! This, however, would be an *excursus*, which it would be extremely dangerous for us to make.

TWO TABLES OF STONE.

The constitution of the Kingdom of Israel was written by the finger of God upon two tables of stone; and the "ten words" or precepts found thereon, were *audibly* spoken in the hearing of the nation. They seem to have been the only words thus spoken, and accompanied, as they were, with the sound of the trumpet and the awful symbols of the Divine presence and power. The balance of the Law was given in charge to Moses by Jehovah, and through him committed to the tribes. When the *constitution*, found in the Decalogue, was accepted by the assembled tribes, they became a distinct nation, and God was acknowledged as their King. It now was organized into a *Theocracy*, and as such must ever be regarded as its true and normal condition.

Constitutions are sacred things. They belong to specified and well-defined peoples. Others may adopt them in part or as a whole, but in so doing they are voluntarily accepted, and must be obeyed, not because they existed in another form and nation, but because

they have been incorporated in a new one. The Christian Church, certainly, was not present at the giving of the Law, nor was the Gentile world; and, consequently, they were not embraced in the provisions made in the constitution of the Kingdom of Israel. One of the precepts of this constitution has respect to the *Sabbath* and its observance—"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work, but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God," etc. (Ex. xx, 8, 9, 10.)

SUPPOSED PATRIARCHAL OBSERVANCE OF THE SABBATH.

Some suppose that the Sabbath was observed by Divine authority before the Flood, and by the patriarchs since, up to the time of the giving of the Law; but those who wish to deal with facts as they are, will be slow to believe it. There is certainly no intimations given in the Old Testament to warrant this opinion. It is said of Abraham, "That he taught his household and children after him to keep the way of the Lord, and to do justice and judgment." (Gen. xviii, 19.) If the observance of the Sabbath was then a statute and an ordinance, Abraham would have spoken of it to his family; and some evidences would have been given of its observance during the four hundred years between Abraham and the giving of the Law. Dr. Isaac Barrow says: "As circumcision was the seal of the covenant made with Abraham and his posterity, so keeping the Sabbath did obsignate (or ratify) the covenant made with the children of Israel *after* their delivery out of Egypt."

We call special attention to the following passages of Scripture, to show that the Sabbath belonged exclusively to the Jewish people, and derives its signification from this fact: "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between *me* and *you throughout your generations*, that you may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. It is a sign between *me* and the children of Israel forever." (Ex. xxxi, 12-17; Ezek. xx, 11, 12; Neh. ix, 13, 14.) In these and other passages God is said to have made *known* to the Jews, and to have *given* them the Sabbath, for special ends and purposes, and for reasons exclusively belonging to them as a people. And for the same reason as he "had led them in the day

by a cloudy pillar, and in the night by a pillar of fire," and as he had "come down upon Mount Sinai," and "spake with them from heaven," and "gave them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments," so had he given them his "holy Sabbath." In no respect can these reasons be assigned for the observance of the Sabbath by the Church of Christ or the Gentile world. The day, to us, has no significance, even if commanded, as it had to the Jewish nation.

It is thought by some that the word "*Remember* the Sabbath day," indicates the fact of its previous existence; but the word *remember* as often applies to the future observance of a precept, as to any thing in the past. It is not only to call to mind, but *to be put in mind of* a thing. Many examples may be found of this in the Word of God. The force of the word in the fourth commandment is, "In all future generations, as the Sabbath is a sign between me and you, *remember* to keep it holy." This institution is intimately associated with the Old Covenant, and like its sacrifices, priesthood, holy places, new moons, days, and times, and years have vanished away and given place to a better covenant, founded upon better promises.

To trace the Sabbath back to the Garden of Eden, is to lose sight of the true conditions of innocence, which do not admit of a division of life into the sacred and profane. The blessing pronounced on the seventh day, whether we regard it as a day of twenty-four hours, or of a great geological period, did not imply rest in Paradise; it applied to the whole creation, which for the first time appeared complete. The life of the world before the Fall was a blessed life—the whole earth was a temple, and all time sacred. The Jewish Sabbath was, among other things, a *reminder* of this happy past, and at the same time a prophecy of its restoration in the future. It was a glorious type of the saint's Everlasting Rest.

The Gentile Churches, in the times of the Apostles, rejected the Jewish Sabbath, as they did circumcision. The Christians were not content with saying that they had neither temple nor altars. They also distinctly avowed, by the mouth of Justin Martyr: "We do not Sabbatize."

The Sabbath among the Jews, as recorded in Exodus, sixteenth chapter, was evidently provisional, and given to them in connection with the manna, to prove the fidelity of the tribes, and to give them

assurance of God's providential and supernatural care over them. Each day of the week, for six days, a miracle was wrought in the descent of the manna, and on each successive sixth day a still greater miracle, in giving them a double quantity, sufficient for the sixth and the seventh days, so that none fell on the seventh day; and what was kept over as a supply for the seventh day did not spoil, as it did on all other days. No mention is made of the Sabbath in the previous chapters in the book of Exodus, and no intimations given that the day had been known or observed, in the book of Genesis, either before or after the Flood, in the days of Abraham or his posterity in Canaan, or during their sojourn in Egypt, or after their deliverance up to the time of the giving of the manna, as recorded in Exodus, sixteenth chapter. It seems most evident that the Sabbath day was first given to the tribes on the occasion to which we have referred, and we have no evidence in the Scriptures that it had ever been observed by any person or people until then. It was afterward incorporated in the Decalogue, as a part of the constitutional law of the nation, just as the Passover, the feast of unleavened bread, the sanctification of the first-born, the building of an altar, sacrifice, and other statutes and ordinances, that were subsequently ratified, and passed into the code of the Jewish institution, though they had been previously observed by the people under the eye of Moses, their leader.

In the third chapter of second Corinthians, Paul draws a striking contrast between the Old Covenant and the New—the Sinaitic Law and the Gospel. The one was "written on tables of stone," (referring throughout to the Decalogue,) the other on the "fleshly tables of the heart." The one he calls "the letter that kills;" the other, "the spirit that gives life." The one is the "ministration of condemnation;" the other, "of righteousness." The one had "a glory which was to be done away;" the other, "a far greater glory that should remain." The one presents to the Jewish nation, Moses, with a face veiled and dim; the other, Christ the Lord, with unveiled face, to the eyes of every Christian beholder. The former has been abolished; the latter is to abide forever. The laws of the Theocracy, including the Ten Commandments, which were fundamental, as they were the organic part of the national code, are abolished. The "written" and "the engraved in stone" have passed away.

MORAL AND POSITIVE LAW.

Whatever was purely moral in the law has passed into the Christian institution, or has been re-enacted by the Divine Lawgiver, not because it was in the national code of the Jews, but because it was right in itself, and, as such, is of perpetual obligation. A moral law, or principle, can never be dispensed with or intermitted. It can not be softened down, or rendered more or less right, or more or less offensive, just or true. There may be mitigating circumstances, relatively considered, on the part of those under it; but in no case can the law itself be set aside or abolished. But such is not the case with *positive law*. It is not necessarily perpetual; it rarely, if ever, is possessed of this attribute; it is not universal, as applying to all ages, states, and peoples. It is provisional and temporary, and in numerous cases may be dispensed with. *A positive law is right, simply because it is commanded.* Positive laws are liable to change, or be dropped by limitation. It is so in all institutions, human and divine. It is also of the nature of such laws that they shall be obeyed as commanded, or they are not obeyed at all. There is no room left for discretion, inasmuch as they are the strongest tests of submission to the will of the lawgiver.

The fourth commandment in the Decalogue belongs to what is properly called *positive law*, and as such can not be received as part of the Christian institution, unless by special enactment. As well may we accept circumcision, the law of the priesthood, animal sacrifice, or the keeping of the Passover. All these are positive laws, and have passed away with the fourth commandment. They were nailed to the cross; they died by limitation; they were but shadows; and when the substance came they vanished away.

The keeping of the seventh day as a day of rest was a statutory appointment, and not the dictate of reason, nor the echo of conscience. Neither reason, nor the fitness of things, nor the voice of conscience, had any thing to do in its appointment. It was a positive command to the Jewish people, and to no other people. It has none of the elements of a moral precept in it. Joshua violated it at the siege of Jericho, just as the Jews neglected the positive rite of circumcision for forty years in the wilderness. David ate the shew bread of the tabernacle, which was not lawful for any but the priests

to eat, and yet was guiltless. The disciples plucked and ate corn in the fields on the Sabbath day, and were justified in so doing by the Savior; and he frequently reprov'd the Pharisees for their morose and punctilious enforcement of the law of the Sabbath to the neglect of mercy, judgment, and the exercise of humanity.

"If," says Mr. Cox, "the duties of the fourth commandment rest upon a law written on the heart of man, how was it possible for the acute and learned Baxter to declare that they are 'but positive institutions, and not naturally known to man as other duties are?'" Baxter says, when speaking on the observance of the Sabbath, or seventh day, "I know nothing in nature alone from whence a man can prove, first, that worship must be (offered) just one day in seven; or, second, just what day of the seven it must be; or, third, what degree of rest is necessary; though reason may discern that one day in seven is a very *convenient* proportion." This is all that can be said of it, after the law is known, that "one day in seven is a very *convenient* proportion of time!" But is this the ground for the establishment and observance of a *positive* law? Sprinkling and pouring are very "*convenient*" acts for baptism, instead of obedience to the positive law of Christian immersion. The *Presbyterian Review* (Vol. I, p. 503, January, 1832) says: "We readily admit that the Sabbath is a ceremonial institution, and that the fourth commandment can not strictly be termed a *moral* law. It forms no part of the law written on the heart, and has no natural and inherent obligation upon the conscience."

The seventh day was set apart as a day of rest, so far as the Decalogue was concerned, and was designed to commemorate the delivery of the Jewish people from their bondage in Egypt. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; *therefore*, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." (Deut. v, 15.)

It was not one day in seven, or a seventh part of time, but specifically the *seventh day* they were commanded to observe. The observance of any other day but the seventh day would not only have been a flagrant violation of the positive law of the Sabbath, but a strange anachronism as a reminder of God's rest after the six days of creation had been completed; and to have transferred the Sab-

bath to the first day of the week would have given the memorial day of creation before any work had been done! And, still farther, it would entirely do away with the typical meaning of the Sabbath, which foreshadows the everlasting rest that remains for the people of God when the working days of our weary life shall end, and we shall enter into rest.

The idea that any day may be observed for the seventh day, as the Sabbath, is fatal to a change in regard to the fourth commandment as found in the Decalogue. By no law or precept can you change the seventh day of the week into the first, or Saturday into Sunday. Those who feel the force of this argument say that the law requires the seventh portion of time; but this is purely sophistical, and without any authority, or show of reason of fact or of testimony.

The Jewish Christians understood this matter much better. The idea never entered into their minds that the law of the Sabbath, or seventh day, had been transferred to the first day of the week. They still clung to the Jewish Sabbath, as they did to the temple service, and also observed the *first day* of the week as a day of blessedness in honor of the resurrection of the Redeemer. *The one day had not in their mind passed over into the other, for both days by them were observed, but for different reasons.*

Jesus offered no disparagement to the law of Moses. He honored it during his life, and taught his disciples to honor it. He never hinted at any *repeal* of the Sabbath for another day. He himself wrought miracles on that day, and vindicated those who exercised the duties of humanity on it. (Matthew xii, 1; Luke xiii, 15; John v. 9.) He not only honored the day, and redeemed it during his life from the hard and unfeeling legality which the leaders of the nation had cast upon it; but, as one has beautifully declared, "he fulfilled its requirements to the very letter, and observed the last Sabbath, according to the Jewish law, to the very letter, when, after his death, he rested in the tomb of Joseph, the door being shut, and no light in the dwelling until the Sabbath was over."

The Apostle reproves the Churches of Galatia in regard to their Judaizing tendencies. "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years." (Gal. iv, 10.) To the Colossians he says: "Let no man judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of

the new moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come, but the body is of Christ." (Col. ii, 16, 17.)

Even among those who had conformed to the Jewish law in regard to meats and drinks, and holy days, he taught them that each one must judge for himself in such matters. So far as Christianity was concerned, they were matters of indifference. There was no moral or immutable principle of right, requiring them to do such things. (Rom. xiv.) Surely such is not the nature of positive institutions.

The writers in the Primitive Church often speak of the Lord's day in *contrast* with the Jewish Sabbath. They never confound the two together. There is not the slightest intimation of a transferring of the one to the other. The New Law, or Christianity, says Justin Martyr, "obliges us to keep a *perpetual Sabbath*." He refers to the "*rest* that Jesus gives to those who take his yoke and learn of him." He says: "We keep no Sabbaths, as the ancients did, looking for an eternal Sabbath." (Heb. iv.)

The transfer of the Sabbath in the fourth commandment, is of modern origin. "It was formerly propounded, first, it would seem, by Dr. Bound, in 1595—a divine of great authority among the Puritans—from whence it was adopted by the Westminster Assembly in their confession, and thence has become a recognized tenet of the Scottish and other Presbyterian communions in Great Britain, and imported by them to America, though as wholly unknown to the continental Protestants as to the old unreformed Churches." (Powell's Christianity.)

In the discussion of this and kindred questions connected with it, we wish to say that there are two precepts or commandments that should not be included in our observations respecting the law of Moses, inasmuch as they are of universal obligation, and have been fully recognized as such by Christ and his Apostles. These are: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, soul, mind, and strength," and "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." These constitute the primary principles of all religion and morality. Instead of forming, essentially, a part of the law, the Savior tells us that *upon* these two precepts "hang all the Law and the Prophets." (Matt. xxii, 36-40; James ii, 8.)

From the above considerations, then, we believe that the fourth

commandment is not obligatory upon us as Christians; but for reasons of the highest consideration, we believe and teach that *the first day of the week*, called also the *Lord's day*, in honor of Christ's resurrection, was observed by Christians, under the immediate sanction and approval of the Apostles, and should be sacredly observed by us until Jesus comes a second time without a sin-offering for our eternal salvation.

We also deem it improper to call the first day of the week the Sabbath day, and would suggest the propriety of discouraging the use of that name to designate the day that celebrates the resurrection of Him who has "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light" in the Gospel.

One of the most serious objections to popular and fashionable Christianity, is its desecration of the Lord's day. It is the natal day of Christ's resurrection, and celebrates his matchless victories over death and Hades. On each return of this day, the symbolic cup and loaf that memorialize his great sacrifice, and the life and incorruptibility brought to light by his resurrection, should be joyfully celebrated.

The ordinance of the Supper is inseparably connected with the ordinary worship of the first day of the week. It stands identified with this day, and has no affinity with the Jewish Sabbath. After his resurrection, the Lord frequently appeared to his disciples on that day, and more fully instructed them in the nature and ordinances of his house. Luke expressly tells us "that he spake to them of the *things* pertaining to the kingdom of God;" "and gave commandments unto the Apostles whom he had chosen." (Acts i, 2, 3.) This he did after his resurrection, and during the "forty days" that he was with them after this event. The Apostles were to "teach" the disciples all the things that Jesus commanded them, and this, certainly, among the number. We have it distinctly declared that the disciples met together for worship on the first day of the week, and that the great central institution of the Church of Christ, namely, the Supper, should then and at that time be observed. Paul arrived at Troas on Monday, and waited seven days, to meet the Church on the first day of the week. By what authority did they meet on the first day of the week rather than the seventh? Was it an arbitrary appointment, or was it not by the will of the

Lord as taught them by his chosen Apostles? The death and the resurrection of our Lord are the great events connected with the redemption of our race, and therefore most properly are they linked together in the worship of the first Christians. We do not read of any solemn and stated meetings of the Church but on the first day of the week. It was the festive day of the Churches of the saints. "On the first day of the week let every one lay in store as the Lord has prospered him." (1 Cor. xvi, 2.) "When you *come together*, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's-Supper." (1 Cor. x, 20.) The Apostle speaks this in the language of rebuke. The coming together of the Church was, then, on the first day. There was one rule applied to all the Churches: "Timothy shall bring you into remembrance of my ways, which be in Christ, as I teach every-where in every Church."

Paul gave orders to all the Churches in Galatia, as well as to the Church in Corinth, to lay by in store their contributions on the first day of the week, as the Lord had prospered them during the previous working days of the week. This was the stated and customary day for the Churches of Christ to assemble for worship, according to Apostolic precedent and example. *Kata mian Sabbaton*—"FIRST DAY OF EVERY WEEK," as Macknight translates it—showing that fifty-two times in the year the Churches met for worship; and the day on which they met was the *first day of the week*. Luke tells us that the model Church in Jerusalem "*continued* steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." (Acts ii, 42.) And to the Hebrews the exhortation was, "*Not* forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another; and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." (Heb. x, 25.)

Notwithstanding the great haste of the Apostle in his journey to Jerusalem, Paul and those who journeyed with him tarried seven days, to meet with the disciples at Troas on "the first day of the week," to "break bread," or partake of the Lord's-Supper. He remained over the Sabbath of the Jews, to be at the stated meeting of the disciples on their great festive day. "Do this in remembrance of me" was no part of the Jewish Sabbath; it did not belong to, and had no affinity with it. It was the *rest* into which God entered after the work of creation was finished, and which was to prefigure the

saints' everlasting rest, to which the Sabbath referred. The Supper of the first day of the week commemorates the sacrificial death of the Son of God; it stands related to the cross and to the crown; it appeals both to our faith and our hope. On this day we lay one hand on the slain lamb, by faith in the great propitiatory sacrifice; and in hope of his second appearing and kingdom, we lay the other on the crown promised to the faithful. These transcendently glorious matters stand in no way connected with the Jewish Sabbath, as found in the Decalogue, either in memory or hope; but they belong to "the pearl of days," the gem of all the week—the first day of the new creation—the morning of hope, and joy, and triumph. They have no affinity with that day of sensuous rest for man and beast, under the sharp sanctions and terrible prohibitions of the "*fiery law*;" but the worship of the first day is rest in action, of the spirit of man risen with Christ. It is the power of the cross in all its reconciling, transforming, and subduing influences, brought within the chambers of the soul, to elevate, to cheer, and to render it divine. It is designed to cherish in our hearts memories dearer, more tender and glorious than "the morning stars" ever sung in reference to the work of creation, or the Jews ever dreamed of in the rest of their Sabbath. It is designed not only to cultivate fellowship with the Father and his Son, and with the Apostles and each other, but to lift up the soul from earth to heaven, from the toils and temptations of the world to the City of God—to the coming of Christ a second time for our eternal salvation—to the general assembly of the first-born—to the new heavens and the new earth.

"The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; therefore the Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath." Man is greater than any day or institution that has been given him. The primitive man was made before any religion was known or required. The above passage was spoken in reference to this. Even the Jewish Sabbath, held so sacred by the nation, "*the Son of Man*" is master of—our elder brother and near kinsman. He nailed it to his cross, and took all its life out of it when he died. He slept in the tomb of Joseph, a distinguished senator of Israel, during all the hours of that last Sabbath that has ever been legally and properly kept. According to the Jewish law there was no fire in that dwelling, and

no labor was performed within it, and the door was shut, and he did not go out of his dwelling during the quiet of that solemn and eventful day. Precious sleep! Divine refreshment! How after the toils and sufferings of his weary life did he enjoy it! And so "he giveth his beloved sleep."

Upon the first day of the week Jesus rose from the dead, and brought life and immortality to light. We need no special and authoritative command to meet on this day for worship. We know that Jesus appeared to his disciples again and again on this day. We feel assured that the first Church of the new age was born, and the Spirit descended on the Apostles and the Church on this day. It would hardly be in keeping with the objects of this day, its sacred festivities, its hallowed memories, its blessed hopes, that it should rest on an authoritative command. As well require by *special precept* that the natal day of our Republic should be commemorated. It is a day of privilege, and every sentiment of gratitude, honor, and obligation require our sacred observance of the Lord's day. No one eats, recreates, and enters upon the enjoyment of any festive occasion by special statute and authoritative command. The yoke of Christ is easy, his burden light. "We are the circumcision, who worship God in spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." But little place is found in the Christian religion for ritualism. While the first day of the week is observed for the reasons we have assigned, Christ has sanctified all days, and given life and its employments a sacredness unknown to former dispensations.

On this day our dress, our manners, our demeanor, should be chaste and reverential—free alike from pharisaic disdain or foolish levity and pride. We are standing on holy ground by Him who was laid in the tomb, and who has ransomed us from death and from Hades. Gravity, simplicity, and spirituality should characterize the true disciple on this memorial day. Its hours should be devoted to our spiritual improvement and the good of others. Its sacred memories and elevated worship should fill us with joy unspeakable, and draw us nearer to God and to each other. May we, like John, be "in the spirit on the Lord's day," and feel its sacred influence throughout the week!

THE NECESSITY FOR A DAY OF REST.

It is not in accordance with the genius and designs of the Christian religion, that its author should legislate for the world in secular matters, or command obedience from the state to his authority. His people are to be a willing people, and his service perfect freedom. But the history of the world, and especially of that part of it that enjoys the civilization of the nineteenth century, shows the necessity of one day in seven for recreation and rest. No state can long enjoy freedom from the evils, physical and moral, that follow the violation of this apparent law of our being. Constant and unceasing labor, or feverish excitement and sensual gratification in connection with it, as in many of our cities, and especially in Paris and in London, can not fail to enervate the system and bring on premature old age. Diseases of the heart and brain are daily becoming more prevalent, and premature decline is fearfully increasing. The desecration of the Lord's day by the Catholics, in their grand processions with music, and dedication of churches, attended with firing of cannon and the accessories of profanity and drinking, are doing much toward debauching the public mind in regard to the sanctities due to this day. The state, in consideration of what is due to public morals and the health of the people, if from no higher motives, should see that this sanitary and useful custom should be respected; and a decent respect for the prevalent religious sentiment of the Protestant public, should lead all to observe the day, or at least refrain from every thing that would shock the prejudices of their neighbors, who regard it as a day set apart for religious purposes.

III.—"CLASSIC BAPTISM."

III.

An Inquiry into the Meaning of the Word βαπτίζω as Determined by the Usage of Classical Greek Writers. By JAMES W. DALE, D. D., Pastor of the Media Presbyterian Church. Fourth Edition. Philadelphia: Wm. Rutner & Co.

WE now come to what Dr. Dale calls the SECONDARY USE OF BAPTIDZO. It is here that he seeks a foundation for sprinkling as baptism—an idea never alluded to in all classic usage, nor in any other usage of *baptidzo*. What he calls the primary use of the verb entirely excludes pour, sprinkle, purify, and every other "mode of baptism" except immersion. This is abundantly proved by his own statements, which we here repeat.

Page 235, under the head of primary use, he gives twelve cases in proof that *batpidzo* means to intuspose, and that baptism means intusposition. On page 17 he says that *baptidzo* "expresses intusposition." On page 21 he says it "intusposes its object within a fluid element." He says, on page 31, that "*baptidzo*, in primary use, expresses condition, characterized by complete intusposition." On page 126 he says, *without any restriction as to primary or secondary use*, that the import of this verb is "vitally dependent upon, and governed by, the idea of intusposition within a closely investing element." This for ever excludes pouring, sprinkling, and touching with moist fingers. Whenever any word is vitally dependent upon, and governed by, an idea, and that idea is separated from the word, it ceases to mean any thing. Sprinkling, pouring, and touching with moist fingers, all exclude "the idea of intusposition within a closely investing element"; and therefore they exclude that on which "the import" of *baptidzo* "is vitally dependent and governed by." Now, words which exclude all that from their meaning can never express "the import" of *baptidzo*. This is fatal to the entire argument of the Doctor, and the Papistic and spurious baptism for which he contends.

On page 127 he says that "the idea of intusposition—inness—necessarily carries with it that of completeness. An object baptized

is completely invested by the baptizing element, whatever it may be." If, then, "the baptizing element" is water, the "object baptized is completely invested" by the water. If the baptizing element is stupor, sleep, sensuality, intoxication, indebtedness, taxation, grief, etc., the case is the same. "Intusposition—inness"—complete investment, do not enter into, nor even approximate the meaning of pour, sprinkle, purify, dedicate, seal, nor the application of moist fingers.

Once more—page 127—he says: "In most cases the baptism of an object carries with it more than the complete intusposition. Comparatively few objects can be wholly enveloped by a fluid, semi-fluid, or other substance, without experiencing a very special and very thorough influence as consequent upon such position." The Doctor here uses the phrase, "wholly enveloped," as equivalent to baptized. And it will be noticed, also, that he does this at the very time when he seeks to introduce what he calls "the baptism of influence," of which he says so much, and to so little purpose. Suppose there is an experience consequent on baptism; does that experience become a part of the meaning of baptism? Can it be said that "comparatively few babies can be sprinkled by a fluid, semi-fluid, or other substance, without experiencing a very special and very thorough influence as consequent on such position? If not, sprinkling and baptism can not be the same. And how about the ritual purification, dedication, and sealing of unconscious babies? Is their experience that of very special, and very thorough influence?

On page 128 the Doctor says: "Drowning is the result of the influence of encompassing waters fully exerted upon a living man; to express such envelopment βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*, to baptize,) was employed," etc. This is another acknowledgment that *baptidzo*, even in connection with "controlling influence," implies envelopment. This makes his secondary and primary meanings the same—both expressing "envelopment," "intusposition," "inness." But when was *hran-tidzo*, to sprinkle, or *katharidzo*, to purify, or *hagiadzo*, to consecrate, used to express such envelopment? Was drowning ever the result of either of these acts? To express such envelopment these words have no power.

He says, page 130, "To drown is, in some respects, quite a favorable representative word" for *baptidzo*. "It is so because, 1. It

expresses the entire envelopment of an object by a fluid element." If "to drown" is "quite a favorable representative" of *baptidzo* "because it expresses the *entire envelopment* of an object by a fluid element," to purify, to pour, and to sprinkle are absolutely unfit to represent *baptidzo*, because neither of them expresses any envelopment at all.

On page 131 the Doctor says: "In all cases where the simple envelopment of the object only is concerned, no word, probably, is more unexceptionable than merse." Well, "merse" is not in use, but "mersion" is, and it is defined by Webster by, immersion. "Merse," then, means immerse; and we have shown, in a previous article, that Dr. Dale, by his own definitions, has shown that immerse and baptize, according to the sense of the Greek verb, are equivalents. But we ask, Do purify, sprinkle, and pour mean to merse? If not, they do not mean to baptize. The man who says, when he sprinkles a person, I baptize thee, affirms what is not true. And if he affirms this in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, he affirms what is not true in these sacred names. This is no trifling matter.

He says, on the same page: "1. This word is of common use in cases where an object is placed in a fluid, semi-fluid, or any easily penetrable material." This is his first reason for preferring this to other words as a representative of *baptidzo*. This reason for selecting "merse," to represent the Greek verb, is just as good for rejecting purify, sprinkle, and pour; for neither of them places its object within any thing.

The Doctor says, page 133: "*To inn* is a word of our language, although of infrequent and restricted use. Its radical idea of *inness* affords the essential idea requisite to develop "a usage which would faithfully represent this Greek word." Here brother Dale admits that the essential idea of *baptidzo* is "inness." Inness excludes, forever, to purify, to sprinkle, and to pour; for this idea is in neither of them. They exclude the "essential idea" of *baptidzo*. Words which exclude the essential idea of another word ought never to be used in place of that word. How can the Doctor sprinkle, and say that he, by that act, baptizes? The affirmation is untrue by his own showing.

He says farther, on this page, that "steep and dip, in their relation to each, and in their distinctive usage, illustrate very forcibly

the two Greek words" *bapto* and *baptidzo*. According to his view *bapto* means to dip, and *baptidzo* means to put the object into a fluid and leave it there to steep. This excludes entirely purify, sprinkle, and pour. Neither he nor his brethren ever say, I steep you; nor, I sprinkle you; nor, I purify you, when they claim to baptize a person. If the original word means to steep, why not say, I steep you? If it means purify, why not say, I purify you? If it means to sprinkle, why not say, I sprinkle you? Why say, I *baptize* you, the radical idea of baptize being, according to brother Dale's own statement, "inness"? All who have examined the classic use of *baptidzo* will admit that it is expressive of an act which results in "inness," or immersion. But this is not true of sprinkle, pour, nor purify. Neither of these words means to baptize. No word, the "radical idea" of which is not that "of inness," can "develop a usage which would faithfully represent this Greek word." Sprinkle, pour, and purify are all excluded by the Doctor's own law.

On page 133 he says: "To steep—steep and dip, in their relation to each other, and in their distinctive usage, illustrate very forcibly the two Greek words," that is, *baptidzo* and *bapto*. *Bapto*, he says, means to dip into and immediately withdraw, and *baptidzo* to put into, and leave to "steep." Both, according to the Doctor's own showing, mean to immerse; the one briefly, and the other for an indefinite period; but in all cases long enough to "steep" the person or thing baptized. Did Jesus command his disciples to "steep" all the nations? This would be a very large "drawing." Did he say, He who believes and is "steeped" shall be saved? But, moreover, do sprinkle, pour, and purify mean to "steep"? If not, they do not mean what the Doctor says baptize means; and they should, therefore, never be used when one says, I baptize. The reason given by brother Dale for defining *baptidzo* by "steep" is that the latter "does express envelopment by a fluid"; and this he regards as its "distinctive usage." All this proves that nothing but immersion is baptism. If the Doctor had spent as much time and ingenuity to prove that baptize (*βαπτίζω*) and sprinkle (*σπρίζω*) do not mean the same thing, as he has to prove that *bapto* and *baptidzo* do not, he would have refuted all the sprinklers so effectually that no one would ever have had the courage to attempt to justify sprinkling for baptism again while the world stands. He would have been equally successful

had he done the same relative to (*ἀγιάζω*), to purify, or (*χέω*), to pour, or (*λουω*), to wash, or (*βρέχω*), to moisten. If there is a difference of meaning between *bapto* and *baptidzo*, how much more difference is there between *baptidzo* and each of these words? And if it is improper to use *bapto* for *baptidzo*, how much more improper it is to use either of the other words for *baptidzo*! There is no common meaning between them and baptize.

On page 134 he says: "If, however, we had a verb, to deep, then to dip and to deep would exhibit the fundamentally distinguishing characteristics, and could well serve as duplicates of these foreign words"; namely, *bapto* and *baptidzo*. If, then, *bapto* means to dip, and *baptidzo* means "to deep" any thing, that is, to put it in deep, sprinkling, pouring, and purifying have neither part nor lot in the matter of baptizing, for there is nothing "deep" in their meaning. Does brother Dale "deep" a baby when he says he baptizes it? If he does, all is right. If he does not, what then? He simply says what is not true, according to his own testimony.

On page 135 he says: "Defining to merse, to drown, to whelm, to steep, to inn, in primary use, as causative of the condition of an object within a closely investing element, without any limitation as to the character of the act inducing such envelopment, and without any limitation as to the time of continuance." This is what he regards as the primary meaning. He farther says, on the same page, "And defining to merse, to whelm, to steep, to baptize, in a secondary use, as causative of a condition induced by controlling influence unlimited as to source, form, or duration. I would define βαπτίζω to mean, primarily, 1. To intuspose, to merse, to drown, to whelm, to steep, to inn; and by appropriation, to suffocate with a fluid (to drown). 2. To influence controllingly, to merse, to whelm, to steep, to inn, to baptize; and by appropriation, to intoxicate." Here we have the Doctor's definition of the Greek word for baptize in full; his primary and secondary, which he regards as embracing all its usages, even by "appropriation."

The primary "appropriation," he says, means to drown. This excludes sprinkle, pour, and purify; for neither of these words signifies to drown. It follows that *baptidzo* can not, even "by appropriation," sustain him in the practice of sprinkling, nor pouring, nor touching with moist fingers, for baptizing.

Under his primary, "intuspose," he gives us the following illustrations: to merse, to drown, to whelm, to steep, to inn. To sprinkle does not mean to merse, nor, to drown, nor, to whelm, nor, to steep, nor, to inn; and therefore, it does not mean what *baptidzo*, primary, means.

As his secondary meaning, he gives, to influence controllingly; and as illustrations, to merse, to whelm, to steep, to inn, to baptize. These verbs embrace all the modifications for which his definition calls as secondary meanings. All these verbs are contained in his primary meaning, except baptize. Why, then, include them in a secondary meaning? are the primary and secondary the same? In all these, to sprinkle, to pour, and to purify are left entirely out of the question. And, as to baptize, its meaning must be found in the primary or secondary meaning of *baptidzo*, both of which exclude sprinkling, pouring, and purifying.

In the language of brother W. Henry Green, D. D., of Princeton Theological Seminary, in his favorable *Critique* on *Classic Baptism*, I will allow no "shuffling," but will hold him and Dr. Dale both to "the strict terms of the bond," to the foregoing definition of Dr. Dale, approved by Dr. Green. This definition excludes every idea except to immerse, and they must stand up to it without any "shuffling," of which no people are more frequently and more extensively guilty than the advocates of sprinkling and pouring. Dr. Green himself says, in his *Critique*, that "the word *baptidzo* describes a submergence, no matter how effected, and with no limitation as to the period of continuance." Does sprinkling describe a submergence? does pour describe a submergence? or, does purify describe a submergence? Submerge, Latin *submergere*, from *sub*, under, and *mergere*, *mersum*, to plunge. Submerge, then, means to plunge under, and the noun, submergence, means, the act of submerging or the state of being submerged. Does the word sprinkle, or pour, or purify, express the act of plunging under, or the state of being plunged under? No Baptist author ever said any thing more exclusive of these acts than both these Doctors have said. But I have more to say of brother Green's *Critique* hereafter.

In the foregoing extracts from Dr. Dale's *Classic Baptism* he has given us repeated definitions of *baptidzo*, both primary and secondary, and in no case has he ever defined it, to sprinkle, pour, or purify.

On the contrary, he has positively said that "to make *baptidzo* mean to pour, or sprinkle, is an error;" p. xxii. If it is an error to make *baptidzo* mean, to pour or sprinkle, is it not erroneous to say, I baptize you, when one only pours or sprinkles a person? And are not all those who have been only poured or sprinkled for baptism really unbaptized? If it is an error to make *baptidzo* mean to pour or sprinkle, it is an error to think that it means either of them; and the man who says, I baptize you, when he does either of these acts, says what is erroneous or not true. It is a solemn matter to affirm what is not true, in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

On page 236 brother Dale says that "*baptidzo*, to baptize, is in most intimate accord with *mergo* and *merse*." This Latin word *mergo* means, as we have already shown, to put under water, dip, plunge, sink, immerse, overwhelm; and Latin lexicographers make it accord with the Greek word *bapto*, to dip. If, then, *baptidzo* is in most intimate accord with *mergo*, as brother Dale affirms it is, then it is in most intimate accord with, to put under water, dip, plunge, sink, immerse, overwhelm; and is exclusive of pour, sprinkle, and purify. Well and candidly did he say that "to make *baptidzo* mean to pour or to sprinkle is an error."

On page 251 the Doctor says, when speaking of the oak part of a spear being baptized when the pine portion of it swam: "The modal act in this baptism is sinking." Where are purify, pour, and sprinkle, then? They are excluded. By what law? Of Catholicism? No! but by the law of language; for purify, sprinkle, and pour do not mean, to sink.

On page 253 he says: "The demand of βαπτίζω is for intusposition." This is true in all cases. Who can affirm this of sprinkle, pour, or purify?

He gives nine cases of baptism on page 256, and, in relation to them, he says, on page 257: "To sink is the final act of mersion in all these cases." This justifies his statement that "to make *baptidzo* mean to pour or sprinkle, is an error."

On page 268 the Doctor gives seven quotations, of which he says: "These are all cases of drowning." Of course, then, they are opposed to purifying, pouring, and sprinkling. He farther says: "The drowning was by mersion, and was the influence designed to be secured over the mersed objects." Now, if the drowning was by the

immersion, it was not the immersion itself. Then *baptidzo* does not mean to drown. The Doctor says: "Mersion does not necessarily drown, because something may intervene to arrest this consummation; but where there is no such intervention, all living animals are drowned by mersion." Brother Dale has certainly forgotten his readings of Natural History, and has overlooked the innumerable "living animals" which inhabit the waters of our globe, none of which are drowned by mersion.

But he says that mersion does not necessarily drown. This being so, drown is not necessarily a meaning of *baptidzo*; and should therefore be rejected from its definition. *Baptidzo* has not the sense of, to drown, in one of the passages quoted under this head. All that is expressed by *baptidzo* is the fact that these things were immersed; the drowning may have been the *consequence* of the immersing, but not the immersing itself. In fact, the Doctor himself says that the drowning was by the mersion—thus making the mersion the cause and the drowning the effect of that cause. But when was a person ever drowned by purifying, or by sprinkling?

On page 269 he says: "We see from such usage how readily *baptidzo* might (did?) advance from the idea of mersion to express directly that of drowning." The Doctor's little interrogative parenthesis here is very creditable to him. He would not say that *baptidzo* did thus advance, and therefore he wrote "did?" with an interrogation point, and then wrapped it up in a parenthesis. There never was any such advance made by *baptidzo*, much less did it ever advance, or rather, recede so as to express purifying, pouring, or sprinkling. Did brother Dale ever know sprinkling to advance so as to express drowning? Did he ever see an instance of such advance in the meaning of pour, or purify? We will allow no "shuffling." We hold him "to the words of the bond," a practice which brother Green likes, and one to which we certainly will not object. The Doctor has said much to confirm immersionists.

On page 269, speaking of the statement of a pilot who did not know whether he would save in a voyage one whom it were better to merse, the Doctor says, relative to the use of the word here: "We are shut up to the meaning, to drown." This being so, we certainly are shut out from the meaning, to purify, to sprinkle, to pour. If the pilot had mersed the man by throwing him overboard, he might

have swum out, or been "picked up," or drowned. But the swimming out, and the picking up, and the drowning, would neither of them be any part of the meaning of *baptidzo*. The drowning, to use brother Dale's own words, might have been "by the mersion." But that which is BY one thing is not THE THING by which it is. If a man is killed by a bullet, the bullet and the killing are not the same. So if one person shoots another, and kills him by the shot, are we, in defining the verb to shoot, "shut up to the meaning," to kill? Many men have been shot and not killed, and many have been baptized, or mersed, and not drowned.

There is a little matter on the preceding page which I must not pass because of the importance which brother Dale attaches to it. He says: "In many of these cases the mersed object was already in the water, and only the head remaining above; yet the putting under the head merely, causing death, is called mersion (baptism) of the person." Why the Doctor threw in the little clause, "causing death," is easily understood, when we remember that he is trying to prove that baptize, in Greek, means to drown. The mersion, or baptism, would have been the same when the whole person was under water, whether he remained in that condition long enough to cause death or not. The causing of death, or not causing death, does not change the meaning of the verb, merse, immerse, or, baptize. The very expression, "causing death," shows that *baptidzo* is, even by our friend, considered the cause, and the death the effect. The cause and the effect are not the same; therefore the mersion and the drowning are not the same.

The Doctor, elsewhere, tries to make much capital out of the fact that when a Baptist leads a person into the water to a suitable depth, and then puts his head and shoulders under the water, he calls this baptism. He says that the Baptist only immerses *a part* of the person, namely, the head and shoulders. What a most remarkable criticism this is! It is unworthy of Dr. Dale and his brethren, who have commended his work. The case supposed, or mentioned, is a case of a man standing in the water, say to his hips. But he is not said to be baptized, or mersed, not because this lower part of his body and his lower extremities are immersed, but because his head and shoulders are not under water. What must be done in order to immerse this man? Put the remaining part of his person under the

water. Then, and not before, he is baptized, or mersed. Suppose, now, that he stands on dry ground, and a sturdy Baptist swings him on his shoulder, face downward, and walks into the water to a suitable depth, and then, with heels high in air, he immerses the man's head and shoulders, would a Greek have said that this man was baptized, or mersed? According to the Greek word he was not baptized, while his head and shoulders remained above water, although his hips and lower extremities were immersed, not because his whole man was above his hips, but because his whole person was not immersed. A man swimming, with only his head out of water, was not regarded as baptized, or mersed; not because his whole man was in his cranium, but because a part of him was out of water. The person, therefore, who approached him under such circumstances, and put his head under, is said to have baptized him. But had the whole person been out of water, except his head, and one had put his head under water, no Greek would have said that, by this, he was baptized.

The cases cited by brother Dale show that, although the baptized persons were in the water, with only the head above, they were not considered baptized till that was also put under. We, therefore, prove, by his own witnesses, that pouring and sprinkling, as baptism, are entirely disproved. There is not the least authority, either in classic or sacred usage, for either of them. Neither John nor any other man ever poured or sprinkled any man into the Jordan, or any other water. But John did immerse people *in water* (*en hudati*), and *into* (*eis*) the Jordan. To pour a man into water you must dissolve him; to sprinkle him into water you must do the same, or separate him into particles. Moses is said to have "*sprinkled*" both the book and all the people—not to have baptized the book and people.

On page 272, after informing us that Dr. Fuller would not accept the word *overflow*, as indicating the meaning of the Greek verb in a given case, Dr. Dale says: "Then my position is, it expresses no form of act at all, but only immerse." This passage is fatal, as is his admission in reference to it, to both sprinkle and pour. We hold him "to the terms of the bond."

On page 277, of sunken ships, he says: "These ships were baptized, were left in a state of baptism, and have continued in it for two thousand years." Were these immersed ships left in a state of purification, of pouring, or of sprinkling for so long a time?

On the passage from *Achilles Tatius* relative to the sleight of hand by which by-standers were made to believe that a sword was mersed in the body by being run down the throat, the Doctor says, by way of paraphrase, that it was "*mersed* running up into the hollow of the handle." Could it be said that it was purified, poured, or sprinkled, running up into the hollow of the handle? The sword, being closely enveloped on all sides, was said by the Greeks to be immersed, or baptized.

On page 278 brother Dale gives six cases of what he calls rhetorical figure, in which baptism or immersion is spoken of as having been effected by "an overflowing wave." All these cases agree with mersion, or immersion, and justify the assertion that "to make *baptidzo* mean pour or sprinkle is an error."

The Doctor says, page xi: "Intusposition within a closely investing medium" is "essential to the primary use" of *baptidzo*. "*Baptidzo* intusposes its object within a fluid element." "*Baptidzo*, in primary use, expresses condition, characterized by complete intusposition." John said, *Ego men baptidzo* EN HUDATI—I indeed merse [or] immerse *in water*. In this case he either used *baptidzo* in the primary or secondary sense. If in the primary, he meant, *I closely invest you in water*. This is all any person can ask as a paraphrase. But if he used the word in the Doctor's secondary sense, then he meant, I indeed controllingly influence you in water!

If John's baptism is to be understood in this secondary sense we must read farther. Then came Jesus from Galilee to the Jordan, to John to be controllingly influenced by him. The fact is that Jesus refused to be influenced controllingly by John, and insisted on being baptized by him. If, then, Jesus would not be controllingly influenced by John, but was baptized by him, controllingly influence and the baptism of John can not be the same. We can not, therefore, say, and having been controllingly influenced; but having been immersed, or, as my friend would paraphrase, having been closely invested in water, Jesus went up "out of" it.

Again, Mark i, 4, 5: "John came controllingly influencing in the wilderness, and preached the controlling influence of repentance for the remission of sins. And then went out to him all the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem; and they were all controllingly

influenced by him in the river Jordan." Verse 9: "And Jesus came and was controllingly influenced by John in the Jordan."

John iii, 22, 23: "After these things Jesus and his disciples came into the land of Judea; and there he remained with them and controllingly influenced them. And John was also controllingly influencing in Ænon near Salem, because there was much water there; and they came and were controllingly influenced."

John iv, 1, 2, 3: "When, therefore, the Lord knew that the Pharisees heard that Jesus made and controllingly influenced more disciples than John—*though Jesus himself did not controllingly influence*—but his disciples, he left Judea," etc.

We now go to the baptism practiced by the Apostles in pursuance of the command of Jesus. Acts x, 47, 48: "Then answered Peter, Can any one forbid water, that these should not be controllingly influenced, who received the Holy Spirit even as we also? And he commanded that they should be controllingly influenced in the name of the Lord." This is quite enough to prove that *baptidzo* is not used in the New Testament, in Dr. Dale's secondary sense. It must, therefore, have been used in the sense of closely enveloping, or, investing in water, which agrees with the Scriptural representation of it, as a burial in baptism, (Col. ii, 12.)

This is a perfect settlement of the whole controversy with all unprejudiced persons. Here Dr. Dale and his indorsers are, as the lawyers and judges would say, *estopped*. The Doctor's own admissions furnish the estoppel. They can proceed no farther, neither logically nor philologically. The man who would take the ground taken by brother Dale, and resist this argument, will resist any other logical demonstration.

No matter if the Doctor should produce a thousand proofs of a secondary meaning; we have proved that they can have no application to the New Testament; and it was with special reference to the New Testament that "Classic Baptism" was written.

There is no spurious ordinance, except the ordinance of sprinkling for baptism, the defense of which has required and received the aid of so much sophistry as this. The fact that places of "much water," as Ænon and the Jordan River, were chosen for its "administration," and that the "administrator and the candidate" "both went down into the water," and that the latter was then "buried in bap-

tism," and "raised to walk in newness of life," and then that they both came "up out of the water," are all ignored by a blind prejudice, for which the people, who are contrölingly influenced by it, must answer to God in the great day. This amount of evidence, on any other subject, would be more than sufficient.

What if *deep* afflictions are, in the Classics, called baptism? Did Jesus command his apostles to go and deeply afflict all the nations? What if being *deeply* in debt is called baptism? Did he command them to go and sink the nations in debt? What if *deep* sexual passion is called a baptism? Did he command them to go and "merse" them in that passion? What if *deep* stupor is called baptism? Did Jesus command his apostles to freight their knapsacks with opium and narcotize all the nations? What if *deep* sleep is called baptism? Did he command his disciples to sing the world to sleep? What if a state of *deep* intoxication is called baptism? Did Jesus say, he who believes and "gets drunk" shall be saved? What means all this solemn quibbling? Is this not heaven-daring sophistry? Is there no God to be feared? No heaven to be sought? No hell to be avoided? The course adopted in the investigation of this subject, by Dr. Dale and the brethren who sustain him, would render it impossible, on their principles, to express the fact that any man, or any thing, was ever immersed. It unsettles the meaning of all words, and obscures the meaning of all sentences; and renders every language under heaven a dead language, and every nation a collection of Babelites, each speaking to the other in an unknown, and an unknowable tongue. All speakers and all hearers would be, on their principles, alike, barbarians to each other.

If the Savior had given the command in English, and said, "Go teach all nations, *dipping* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," Dr. Dale could have mystified this word *dipping*, as successfully as he can *baptidzo*, and in the same way. He could say *dip* is not a word which expresses any "form of act." It means "to wet, to bathe, to examine slightly, to engage in, more or less deeply, to mortgage, to take out, to dye, to stain, to imbue, to tincture." Then he could say that any thing could be wet by pouring, and sprinkling; and that although *dip* does not mean to pour and sprinkle, yet either of these is capable of effecting a *dipping*, because, to *dip*, means to wet; and either of them is capable of wetting!

Farther, he might say that dip means to dye, and any thing can be dyed by sprinkling it all over with dye; and that although dip does not mean to sprinkle, yet a dipping can be effected by sprinkling, because sprinkling is capable of dyeing.

This pettifogging is unworthy of brother Dale and the institution of baptism. It is transparent folly and wickedness. It is a sin against reason and the God of reason. Is it a "sin of ignorance"? Let us hope it is, and therefore pardonable. How strangely men will sometimes reason to support the merest human tradition, and that, too, in direct opposition to a divine institution! Every man who is conversant with Church History, knows that pouring and sprinkling for baptism have no authority in the Holy Scriptures; and that they are merely human substitutes for immersion, ordained by no Apostle, and without any support from the meaning of *baptidzo*.

"SYMBOL WINE BAPTISM."

These are Dr. Dale's own words, and yet he insists that when *baptidzo* is used of intoxication it is not used figuratively! Is not the symbolic use of a word a figurative use of it? Is not the symbolic use of a thing a figurative use of that thing? (pp. 323-4)

"Symbolic wine baptism," according to our author, is a state of drunkenness induced by wine. This state of drunkenness is, then, a symbol of baptism! The Doctor says that *baptidzo*, in its secondary sense, conveys the idea of "completeness." This drunkenness, then, to be a symbol of baptism, must be complete, as brother Dale frequently says, "controlling"? Why not say *overwhelming*? This would come much nearer the primary meaning of *baptidzo*. But it is evidently the Doctor's intention to remove this verb in its secondary use, entirely out of sight and hearing of its "primary use." What an effort for a linguist! This requires a new system of hermeneutics, for the sake of a special exegesis, to answer some special purpose. How unworthy of a liberal scholarship! Is this "symbolic wine baptism" a symbolic wine *sprinkling*? Or is it a symbolic wine purification? Or is it a "symbolic wine controlling influence"? If it is a *symbolic* influence, it is not an influence literal, in its symbolic sense.

It is proper, when we would speak of the "completeness" of intoxication, to say, immersed in intoxication; but never poured, nor

sprinkled with intoxication. Neither sprinkling nor pouring is significant of "completeness," and, therefore, they can not be baptism.

The passage from Spencer, quoted by brother Dale to prove that "symbolic wine baptism may be set forth by sprinkling the intoxicating element," is proof to the very contrary of what he affirms. Here is the passage:

"Pour out the wine without restraint or stay;
Pour not by cups, but by the belly full;
Pour out to all that wall,
And sprinkle all the posts and walls with wine,
That they may sweat, and drunken be withal."

Not one word is here said of baptism, nor is the subject of baptism even alluded to. How can a symbolic baptism "be set forth" without being mentioned? There is not the least evidence that baptism was in the mind of Spencer when he composed these lines. But, farther, the poet speaks three times of *pouring out* the wine—of pouring out without restraint, and without "stay," or stopping. This is much more than a sprinkling. And when he speaks of sprinkling the posts and walls with wine, it is not such a sprinkling as the babies get, but one that will cover the "posts and walls" with sweat, or perspiration, that they may drunken be withal—with all those persons to whom the wine was poured out "without restraint or stay." A liberal use of the wine, both to the men and to "all the posts and walls" to profuse perspiration, is spoken of, but nothing is said of the baptism of either, neither literally nor symbolically. To translate this passage into the language to which *baptidzo* belongs, we would be required to use *ekcheo* for pour out, and *hrantidzo* for sprinkle. We would have no use for *baptidzo*, and could not use it in the translation of the passage.

How can we account for the fact that our brother can see a symbol when there is none, and baptism when there is none? Not from the "controlling influence" of "wine poured out without restraint or stay," nor from "the belly full," but from the want of even a *sprinkling* of proof. He says: "This baptism claims attention in other respects. 1. A physical element was present in the baptism and causative of it, *while there was no mersion* in the physical element."

It is true that wine is sometimes spoken of as the means of an

immersion, when that into which, or in which the immersion takes place is not expressed, but is understood. In other cases the ellipses are supplied. When a man is said to be immersed *by* wine, and there is not an ellipsis of that in which the immersion is effected, we are enabled to understand, by the full expression, the elliptical sentences. Thus, also, in other similar cases, when the means are mentioned, and the medium omitted. JOSEPHUS, *ANTIQUITIES OF THE JEWS*, BOOK X, ch. ix, 4, speaking of the murder of Gedaliah when thoroughly intoxicated, says: "Seeing him in this condition, and (βεβαπτισμενον) baptized by drunkenness into stupor and sleep, Ishmael leaping up, with his ten friends, slays Gedaliah and those reclining with him at the banquet." This is a full expression of the idea of the condition of those who were said to be baptized by wine, or by its effects, when taken to excess. If the author had said, baptized by drunkenness, and steeped, then brother Dale would have said that he was "controllingly influenced" by intoxication. But when it is fully expressed, by the addition of "into stupor and sleep," the case of baptism by the use of intoxicating liquor is rendered clear, and *deep sleep*, and stupor, is the medium in which the baptism takes place, and intoxication is the means by which it is effected.

Again: CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *The Educator*, Book II, ch. ii: "But drowsy is every one who is not watchful for wisdom, but is (βαπτίζμενος) immersed by drunkenness into sleep." Here drunkenness is that *by which* the immersion takes place, and sleep is that *in which* it takes place.

HELIODORUS, *Æthiopiis*, *Story of Theogenes and Chariclea*, Book IV, ch. xvii: "When midnight had immersed the city in sleep, an armed band of revelers took possession of the dwelling of Chariclea." Here midnight is the baptizer and sleep is the medium. When people are said to be baptized in sleep, the meaning is that they are in *deep sleep*—not that they are sprinkled with sleep—merely cat-napping.

CHRYSOSTOM, ADMONITION I, TO THEODORUS: "Therefore, I beseech thee, before thou art deeply immersed by this intoxication, to return to soberness, and to arouse and thrust off the Satanic debauch." Here the medium of the immersion is not mentioned, but it is alluded to by the word "arouse," showing that the *sleep* of drunkenness is referred to. So Bacchus—the intemperate use of

wine—"immerses in sleep, neighbor of death."—(*Evenus of Paros, Epigram XV.*)

When an immersion is said to take place *by* wine, or *by* opium, no one supposes that the meaning is that the immersion is *in* these substances, but in "sleep and stupor." This brother Dale should have known. So that if wine is present and causative of the baptism, "sleep and stupor" are also present at the same time, and are the *medium* of baptism. And as the Doctor insists that this secondary use of *baptidzo* is not figurative, and as the wine is "physical," and the man is physical, and the sleep and stupor are also physical, the baptism must be physical likewise. And physical baptism is admitted by brother Dale to be "intusposition within a closely enveloping medium." Where, then, is his secondary meaning in these examples?

If a man is immersed *by* debt, or by taxes, he is immersed *in* insolvency, or *in* poverty. If he is immersed *by* calamities, he is immersed *in* trouble, unless he is like the old man who said he had not been clear of pain for sixty years, and who, when his friend manifested sympathy for him, said that was unnecessary, for he had suffered pain so long that he "kinda enjoyed it."

Brother Dale says that the husband of Thebe, when drunk, was, in the language of the Greeks, baptized (mersed) as really and truly as if, instead of being laid in his chamber, he had been laid "in the lowest cavern of the sea." I have no doubt but the scamp was "drunk all over"—"closely invested in sleep and stupor." He was asleep to the exterior surface of his entire skin, wrapped in sleep, "sunken down in deep sleep," immersed in stupor. There is no dispute here; for *baptidzo* implies all this. There was much more than a sprinkling, or, indeed, a pouring out "without restraint or stay," in his case. He took the wine, as brother Dale quotes from Spencer, "not by cups, but by the belly full." The tyrant was drunk internally and externally; there was not a scrap of his brutal hide that was not "intusposed."

THE DOCTOR'S ELEMENTAL BAPTISM.

Brother Dale says that "the mode of using this baptizing element was by drinking." We are not discussing the mode, nor the manner of baptizing, but the *meaning of baptidzo*. But we will here say, that

if the fact be as stated by him, it was not by purifying, nor by sprinkling. The wine baptized or immersed this man by enveloping him, soul and body, "in sleep and stupor." So says the Greek before quoted. Dr. Dale also says, "The intellect and the body are baptized."

All the tropical uses of this verb, *baptidzo*, are derived from the primary use, and although an adherence to the primary meaning may not always make the discriminations which we make in form, when we mean a "complete envelopment," effected either by putting the baptized object into a fluid, or by causing that "intusposition" by causing the fluid to pass over it, yet to the linguist the primary use is never lost sight of. *Immerse*, embracing all the acts by which what brother Dale calls intusposition is effected, whether that intusposition be momentary or permanent, is the best word by which to translate *baptidzo*, uniformly, in the English language.

The Doctor says, page 326: "A fluid element may be used as an agency in baptism, and accomplish such baptism, without involving the baptized object in a physical mersion. This is a vital position, and, if made good, carries every thing with it." I like to see a man state his belief confidently; that shows his earnestness. And, moreover, if he can sustain his confident statements; they become authoritative after awhile; but, if he can not, such statements lose all force.

"A fluid element," in his proposition, is used of any fluid element; otherwise he would have said, "Some fluid elements may be used," etc. He then instances wine, elixir of opium, and water. As to the effect of the extravagant use of wine, as in the cases mentioned by him, the immersion was, if a case of agency, as he alleges, *by*, not *in*, the wine. So also of the elixir of opium. The immersion in one case is in a drunkard's sleep, as we have already shown. The other is an immersion in stupor! Now, both the drunken sleep and the stupor of the narcotized are as *physical* as any thing in Nature. They are physical effects of physical substances on physical organisms. What else can these baptisms be but physical mersions, since brother Dale translates the Greek word for baptism by mersion? Moreover, in both cases there is an "intusposition," an "envelopment," to use the Doctor's own words, in both the sleep and the stupor. The persons referred to are not only asleep, and stupid *all over*, but they are pervaded by sleep and stupor—they are asleep and stupid externally

and internally. This is not any more a baptism of influence than any other baptism is. It is a real physical stupor and sleep. The one is *buried* in sleep—*deep sleep*; and the other is *buried* in stupor—*deep stupor*. How inappropriate and untrue to say of these men, that they were sprinkled, poured, or purified by wine and the elixir of opium! This "vital position" being not "made good," does not "carry every thing with it." The Doctor's confident assertions have, with us, long since ceased to inspire confidence. He often feels an assurance which few men can feel under the same state of affairs.

On page 327 the Doctor says: "Water has many qualities besides that which adapts it for physical envelopment. It will *make very wet*, as in Dr. Fuller's case, when poured on profusely; it will *make unintoxicating* when poured in wine; and it will *make cold* when poured on hot iron. And all these cases of controlling influence, apart from physical envelopment, the Greeks called baptisms." According to this logic the word baptize must embrace in its meaning all that the qualities of the various substances in which, with which, or by which any object can be baptized! So that, as water can make very wet, baptize means to make very wet! And as water poured into wine makes it unintoxicating, baptize means to make unintoxicating! And as it will make hot iron cold when poured on it, it means to make hot iron cold by pouring! That is, it means to make cool by pouring! I suppose, then, that as it will quench thirst, to baptize must mean to quench thirst! As it will strangle, baptize must mean to strangle! As it will make vegetables grow, baptize means to make vegetables grow! And as water will extinguish fire, to baptize means "to put out fire"! In all these cases there is "controlling influence." When he affirms that all the cases of "controlling influence" which he specifies "the Greek called baptisms," he affirms what is untrue, unscholarly, and absurd. Brother Dale had controlling influence on the brain. This alleged secondary meaning of *baptidzo* is untrue, both in fact and in figure. On examination it vanishes like smoke. *Although baptism may have a controlling influence over persons and things baptized, still, controlling influence is no part of the meaning of the word baptize. It is only the EFFECT of an act, and not THE MEANING of an ACT.*

I feel sorry for brother Green, of Princeton, and other brethren, for having so hastily adopted and recommended a book containing such a strange and unfounded theory of *baptidzo*. Upon a thorough

review of "CLASSIC BAPTISM" they must feel excessive mortification. Are their commendations of this work to descend to posterity? What a comment on their scholarship!

Is it possible that the Pedobaptist Ministers and editors have sanctioned the assertion that *baptidzo* means to influence controllingly? If it does, how does it differ from the verbs to sleep, to drink, to fast, to eat, to laugh, to cry, to sing, to pray, to censure, to commend, to nurse, to kill, and many other verbs, too numerous to mention? Do all these verbs mean to baptize, simply because the *acts* which they represent *result* in influence—in controlling influence? Then, to take medicine, in one case, means to cure, and in another it means to kill, because the taking of medicine has both killed and cured. A greater absurdity than brother Dale's secondary meaning of *baptidzo* was never written or spoken.

If his doctrine is true, then his teaching concerning the irreconcilable difference between *bapto* and *baptidzo* is false. If *bapto* means, primarily, to dip, and secondarily, to dye, do not both the dipping and the dyeing exert a controlling influence over the object dipped? Those who have "dipped candles" know that dip has a controlling influence; and those who have dyed, or colored, know that dyeing has a controlling influence. According to his philosophy of language, *bapto* and *baptidzo* are equivalents in their secondary sense.

But how about sprinkling? Does that influence controllingly? Examine the sprinkled infants and see. What controlling influence does it have over them? The *teaching* of their parents and Ministers concerning sprinkling has controlled many of them, but the mere act of sprinkling never controlled one of them. Of course, then, sprinkling can not be baptism, not even in Dr. Dale's secondary use of *baptidzo*.

But the Doctor, by his controlling influence, cools hot iron by water. According to the classic usage this is done by dipping into water, "as smiths temper their tools." But brother Dale has seen hot iron cooled by pouring, and by sprinkling cold water on it. Therefore dipping, pouring, and sprinkling are the same in this cooling business. *This is decidedly cool.* Dip means to cool, pour means to cool, sprinkle means to cool, and to blow on hot food will cool it; therefore to dip, to pour, to sprinkle, and to blow are all the same! Well, to lie outdoor in a cold night will cool hot iron also. Now,

as *baptidzo* means to cool, and cooling may be effected by pouring, sprinkling, blowing, and lying outdoors in a cold night; therefore Jesus commanded his Apostles to go and teach all the nations, dipping them, pouring them, sprinkling them, blowing them, or laying them outdoor in a cold night—just as the candidate might prefer! Such is the result of brother Dale's reasoning on *baptidzo*! But glass-blowers say that swinging through the air, and ladies that fanning, will cool; therefore swinging and fanning are "modes of baptism"! Yes, any act that will cool any thing, or that will "controllingly influence" any thing, is baptism!—in the secondary use of *baptidzo*, and the Greeks would call all such changes baptism! To your shades, O ye Classics!

Brother Green, of Princeton, do you really feel proud of this "secondary meaning" of *baptidzo*? Do you really think, on a review of this work, that it is an "*armory no minister can well do without*"? God save the ministry from drawing arms or munitions for a theological war from such a source! You admit that there "may be an occasional appearance of special pleading" in brother Dale's works on baptism. This occasion is rather frequent, though, I think, not intended by him.

I will now call attention to the Doctor's

"COROLLARY."

"Whenever any liquid, possessed of a quality capable of exercising a controlling influence of any kind whatever, is applied to an object so as to develop such influence, it is said, on all classical authority, to baptize that object, without regard to mode of application, and with as little regard to physical position."

This is brother Dale's "corollary," his inference, his deduction, his inferred consequence, from the usage of *baptidzo* in connection with liquids! Now, water is included by himself among the liquids of which he speaks. We will see whether, in the use of *baptidzo*, there is any "regard to physical position." *Polybius*, in describing a sea-fight between the Romans and Carthaginians, says that the latter had greatly the advantage over the former in the structure of their vessels and the skill of their crews. When the Carthaginians were hard pressed they retreated with safety into the open sea, because of the

superior sailing qualities of their vessels, and when their enemies pursued them they changed their course, and attacked the most advanced of their pursuers on their sides, who were embarrassed by their heavy sailing vessels and the want of skill, and the Carthaginians made continual assaults on them (καὶ πολλὰ τῶν σκαφῶν ἐβάπτιζον) *and baptized many of the vessels*. Is there no "regard" here to the "physical position" of these vessels? If not, we may suppose they were "made very wet," and that it "cooled" them; for brother Dale gives these senses to *baptidzo* where there is no reference to position, but to what he calls controlling influence! Now, as a thing can be made very wet, and can be cooled by sprinkling, we may believe that the Carthaginians sprinkled the Roman vessels, may we? Or, must we think that the cruel Carthaginians immersed, or submersed the vessels of the Romans? If they only sprinkled them, the fight was only a sprinkling of a battle, and unworthy of a place in history only as a farce of the most silly character.

This same *Polybius* tells us that *Archimedes* constructed engines for the defense of Syracuse, by which he raised the prows of the Roman vessels out of the water, so that they were erect on the stern, and then let them fall from on high, and they were baptized, (ἐβαπτίζονενα,) being filled with sea water and confusion. Has this any regard "to physical position"? *Archimedes* intended more than a wetting, a cooling, or a sprinkling, in this case.

Plutarch, describing the same thing, says that some of these vessels being hauled up by the prow till they were erect on the stern, with iron hands, or beakes like those of cranes (ἐβάπτιζον), *they baptized* them. What did they do with these vessels? Did they cool them, sprinkle them, or did they immerse them? or submerge them? It is not the "mode" that we are inquiring after, but the *thing* done.

Aristotle, speaking of rushes and sea-weeds, four days sail, with an east wind, outside of the pillars of Hercules, westward of the Straits of Gibraltar, says that "at ebb-tide they (μὴ βαπτίζεσθαι) *are not baptized*, but when it is flood-tide (κατακλύζεσθαι) they are overflowed." Is there no "regard to physical position" here? What did the flood-tide do to these rushes and sea-weeds which affected their baptism? Did it cool them, sprinkle, or sanctify, or purify them? The true answer is, it "overflowed" them. *When not overflowed, they were not baptized; but when overflowed, they were baptized*. Did

Aristotle understand Greek? This one passage is conclusive on this subject, and a complete refutation of Dr. Dale's book.

Eubulus, in his comic hyperbola, says of a man whose vessel was wrecked in a storm and engulfed:

"Who now (τετάρτην ἡμέραν βαπτίζεται) *a fourth day is baptized*, leading the famished life of a miserable mullet."

Mullets live in water in a state of immersion, not in a sprinkled condition.

Polybius speaks of a harpoon made for capturing the sword-fish. He says it was compacted of both oak and pine, so that if it falls into the sea it will not be lost; because when the oaken part (βαπτίζομενος) is immersed, or baptized by the weight, the rest is buoyed up, and is easily recovered. Is there no "regard here" to physical position? What is buoyed up, not being immersed, is said not to be baptized; but the weighty part which is immersed is said to be baptized by the weight. Did *Polybius* understand Classic Greek?

Polybius says, in his account of the passage of the Roman army through the swollen river Tebea, that they passed through with difficulty, and that the foot-soldiers were (βαπτίζομενοι), *baptized*; (ἐως τῶν μαστῶν) *as far as of the breasts*, or, as we say, to the breast. *Polybius* regarded no part of these soldiers as having been baptized which had not been immersed in water. We repeat the question, Did *Polybius* understand Greek? If he did brother Dale does not.

In his history of the battle at sea between Philip and Attalus, near Chios, he says that a vessel belonging to the latter was (τετρωμένην καὶ βαπτίζομενην ὑπὸ νεῶς πολεμίας) *pierced and baptized by a hostile ship*. The piercing preceded the baptism, or the immersion. Is there here no regard to physical position?

Strabo, in his account of the subterranean channel through which the river Pyramus forced its waters, says that the force of the water makes such resistance that a dart hurled down into the channel is (μόλις βαπτίζεσθαι), *with difficulty baptized*. Any one who has ever attempted to throw a dart, or a light stick, endwise into water forced into a very rapid current will easily understand with what difficulty it can be immersed, or baptized.

The same author says that the waters of the marsh lakes around Aragas, or Agrigentum, in Sicily, had the taste of sea-water, but

a different nature. For even those who could not swim were not βαπτίζεσθαι) *baptized*, floating like pieces of wood. According to this author, what did not go under water, but floated on top, was not baptized.

Again, he says that the soldiers of Alexander (ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν ἐν ὕδατι γενέσθαι τὴν πορείαν συνέβη μέχρι ὀμφαλου βαπτίζομένων), *marched the whole day in water, baptized as far as the waist*. The baptism is restricted, in this statement, to the parts of the soldiers which were immersed. Did *Strabo* understand Greek?

When speaking of the specific gravity of the water of the lake Sirbonis, he says: "There is no need of being a swimmer, and he who enters in is *not baptized* (βαπτίζεσθαι) but is lifted out." Any thing which would swim, and not become immersed, according to this author, could not be said to be baptized. Did *Strabo* understand Greek? If he did brother Dale does not. But immersionists understand it just as *Strabo* did, and as all the other authors quoted did.

Diodorus, the Sicilian, speaking of the defeat of the Carthaginian army on the bank of Crimisus, when many on the retreat attempted to swim through the swollen stream, says: "The river, rushing down with the current, increased in violence" (πολλὸς ἐβάπτισε), *baptized many*. Is there no regard to physical position here?

Again, in his notice of the rapid rise of the water of the River of Egypt, he says that most of the wild land animals were surrounded by the stream and perished (βαπτίζόμενα), *being baptized*, but some which escaped to the high grounds were saved. Did any animal ever perish by sprinkling?

He says the commander of the fleet who led on the line and first joined in battle was slain, and his ship (βαπτισθεῖσης) *being baptized*, confusion seized the fleet of the barbarians. Did this confusion arise without any regard to the physical position of the leading ship of the line? Was that ship made "very wet," made "cold," sprinkled, or was it immersed? Did *Diodorus* understand Greek? If he does brother Dale and his commanders do not.

Josephus, of Aristobulus, who was drowned by the command of Herod, in a swimming bath, says that while he was swimming they continually pressing him down (καὶ βαπτίζοντες) *and baptizing* him as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him. Did they wet him, sprinkle him, cool him, examine him slightly, or

mortgage him? Or did they immerse him till he was entirely suffocated? Had they no "regard for physical position" in this transaction, as Dr. Dale and his commenders affirm? Could they have suffocated him without "regard to physical position?"

Speaking of this same man again, he says, "And there, according to command (*βαπτίζόμενος*), *being baptized* by the Gauls in a swimming bath, he dies." The death was the result of the baptism. Did they sprinkle him to death? and that without "regard to physical position"? Where is brother Dale's *corollary*? Is it well founded?

Again, he speaks of a cowardly pilot, "who through fear of a storm, before the blast comes, voluntarily (*ἐβάπτισεν*) *baptized* the vessel." Had this pilot no "regard to the physical position" of his vessel?

Again, when he described the condition of a vessel in a storm, in the port of Joppa, in the time of a storm, he says of many of the vessels, "And many struggling against the opposing swell sailed toward the open sea—for they feared the shore, it being rocky, and the enemies upon it—and the billow *rising high above* (*ἐβάπτισεν*) *baptized* them. Has the word *baptidzo*, in its meaning, no "regard to physical position"? In the language of brother Green, of Princeton, we "allow no shuffling"; we "hold them to the terms of the bond."

In his account of the fleeing Jonah, when "the Lord sent out a great wind into the sea, and there was a mighty tempest in the sea, so that the ship was likely to be broken," and when the "marines were afraid, and cried every man to his god, and cast forth the wares that were in the ship into the sea to lighten it of them," (Jonah ii, 4, 5,) Josephus says that the ship was "just about (*βαπτίζεσθαι*) *to be baptized*." Was it just about to be sprinkled? or was it just about to be immersed, or submersed? Would the throwing of the cargo overboard be necessary to prevent the sprinkling of the ship? Is there no "regard to physical position" in the use of the word here?

This same author in giving an account of an incident in his own life says: "For our vessel (*βαπτισθέντος*) *having been baptized* in the midst of the Adriatic, being about six hundred in number, we swam through the whole night." Has the word no "regard to the physical position" here? In all these uses of *baptidzo*, is not the "physical condition," resulting from "the act of baptism," *the very cause of its use*? Resultant "condition" is the reason, and the

only reason why *baptidzo*, to immerse, and not *cheo*, to pour, *brecho*, to wet, nor *rhantidzo*, to sprinkle, is used. What becomes of Dr. Dale's capitalized "*corollary*," in view of all these facts?

In speaking of the contest of the Jews with the Romans, on the Sea of Galilee, Josephus says of the Jews: "And when they ventured to come nigh, they suffered harm before they could inflict any, and (*ἐβαπτίζοντο*) were baptized along with their vessels," and that "(*τῶν βαπτισθέντων*) those of the baptized who raised their heads, either a missile reached, or a vessel overtook." Does not *baptidzo* have special regard to physical condition here?

The same author, in speaking of some of the distinguished Jews, says: "And after the calamity of Cestius, many of the distinguished Jews swam away, as when a ship (*βαπτίζουμένης*) is being baptized, from the city." The swimming away here, in reference to the ship, has direct "regard to physical condition," as it was then taking place, when the ship was being baptized. Sailors do not swim away from their vessels when they are being sprinkled.

Plutarch quotes this sibyl oracle in reference to Athens: "A bladder, thou (*βαπτίζῃ*) mayest be baptized, but it is not possible for thee to sink." Two verbs are here used of the bladder: the one is passive, thou mayest BE baptized; the other active, it is impossible for THEE to sink. The bladder, although it could not by its own effort sink, yet it could be immersed or baptized by external force. Direct regard is here had "to physical position" in the use of *baptidzo*, contrary to the Doctor's positive denial of the most obvious truth.

In speaking of revelry among Alexander's soldiers on their return from his Eastern conquests, Josephus says: "Thou wouldst not have seen a buckler, or a helmet, or a pike; but the soldiers, along the whole way, (*βαπτίζοντες*) baptizing [or dipping] with cups, and horns, and goblets, from great wine-jars and mixing-bowls, were drinking to one another." Dr. Dale has often affirmed that *baptidzo* never means to dip. Here is a clear case to the contrary of his assertion. These cups, horns, and goblets being dipped into wine-jars, the wine was said to be dipped from them. Had the wine been poured out of the wine-jars, it would have been said that it was poured from them, not dipped or baptized from them. This is by no means the only instance in which *baptidzo* means to dip, as I intend to show before I finish this review. There is a direct reference to the change of

"physical position," both in regard to the cups, horns, and goblets, and also to the wine.

The same author quotes the following from Aristophanes: "He is praised," says he, "because he dipped (*ἐβάπτισεν*, baptized) the stewards; being not stewards, but sharks." The English translator of the writings of Plutarch translates the Greek verb by "ducking." The author here says that those persons who were "dipped" were not *tanias* (stewards), but *lamias* (sharks), and therefore the praise for putting or dipping them in water. Special regard is had "to physical position," contrary to the Doctor's "corollary."

According to Lucian, Timon, the misanthropist, resolved that "if the Winter's torrent were bearing one away, and he with outstretched hands were imploring help, to thrust even him headlong, (*βαπτίζοντα*), *immersing*, so that he should not be able to come up again." Regard is certainly had here "to physical position."

Hippocrates, in giving the symptoms of inflammation and swelling of the throat, says: "And she breathed as persons breathe after (*βεβαπτισθαι*) having been baptized," or dipped in water. "Physical position" is here clearly referred to. Again he says: "And she breathed as if breathing after (*βεβαπτισθαι*) baptized," or dipped into water. All these passages, and I think all others in which the word occurs, are diametrically opposed to the Doctor's "corollary."

The Doctor says in this corollary that "whenever any liquid possessed of any quality capable of exerting a controlling influence of any kind whatever is applied to an object so as to develop such influence, it is said, on all classical authority, to baptize that object," etc. This is a *general* conclusion from a *particular* premise, and therefore illogical. I think he has mentioned but three liquids of controlling influence, viz.: water, wine, and the "elixir of opium." Taking his own argument as it stands, he infers that what is true of these three liquids is true of all liquids! Now, we affirm that *baptidzo* is never used of any influence whatever; but, when a man is affirmed to be baptized in sleep by the influence of wine, the influence is referred to wine, not to *baptidzo*. The influence of the wine is not predicated of the man, nor is it called his baptism. What is predicated of the man is that he was baptized or immersed in intoxication and sleep. Intoxication means the state of being

intoxicated. Wine and some other drinks are capable, when taken in sufficient quantities, of putting a man into this state. But the "controlling influence" is not called the baptism. The baptism consists in being *entirely in that state*. No man who was merely intoxicated was said to be baptized in intoxication. A man is controllingly influenced when he can yet walk, but the Greeks called not this a baptism. What they called a baptism in intoxication was a "physical envelopment" in that state, a total immersion in it. A man's whole person may be as totally in a state as in water, and as literally so. When a man is baptized in water he is enveloped in water. The same is true of baptism in intoxication and sleep; the man is buried in them. It requires not only "a controlling influence," but an *overwhelming* influence to baptize one in intoxication and sleep. Total intoxication and total sleep are *literal immersions*, not pourings, not sprinklings, not purifications.

But the Doctor says that "the mode of application" of these fluids is a matter of perfect indifference. Then a man can be narcotized, put into a deep sleep, and intoxicated by pouring the medicine and the liquor on him, or by sprinkling him with these substances! To this we say nothing more; the position is too absurd for argument.

A man was never said by any classic Greek author to be baptized in intoxication, in sleep, in poverty, in ignorance, in obloquy, in grief, in anger, in vehement desire, in stupor, in suffering, in taxes, in trouble, in disease or magical arts, or in any thing else, who was not immersed in these things, either in fact or in figure. No man was ever, in all classic usage, said to be poured, wet, washed, sprinkled, nor purified by, or in any of these things. *Baptidzo*, owing to its primary meaning, was always used, when used of these things, instead of either of the above words, because they would not convey the idea of the classic authors. To express the *depth* of all these things *baptidzo* was fully adequate. To say that a man was sprinkled with drunkenness, indebtedness, ignorance, obloquy, grief, anger, vehement desire, profound stupor, misfortunes, taxes, trouble, disease, and magical arts, etc., would be to say that he was in rather comfortable circumstances; but when we affirm that he is immersed in these things we express a very different and opposite idea, and for this *baptidzo* was used by the Classics.

We have now come to brother Dale's

"CONCLUSION,"

with a more confident conviction, that there never was a cause which called for such a strange course of argument as does the cause of sprinkling for baptism. All classic authority is opposed to it, and all ecclesiastical history confronts it at every step. It was never, for many centuries, regarded as valid baptism except in some extreme cases of fancied necessity. Nothing is more true than are these words of the great Reformer, John Calvin. "*Ipsium baptizandi verbum mergere significat, et mergendi ritum veteri ecclesiæ observatum fuisse constat.*" That is, "the word baptize, itself, signifies immerse, and it is certain that the rite of immersing was observed by the ancient Church." This every person who has examined the subject knows to be true.

Luther, the great German Reformer, says, when writing On the Sacrament of Baptism: "*Primo, nomen baptismus græcum est; Latine potest verti mersio, cum immerginus aliquid in aquam, ut totum tegatur aqua. Et quamvis ille mos jam aboleverit apud plerosque (neque enim totos demergunt pueros, sed tantam paucula aqua perfundunt) debebeant tamen prorsus immergi, et statim retrahi, id enim etymologia nominis postulare videtur.*" That is, "First, the noun baptism is Greek; in Latin it can be rendered immersion, when we immerse any thing into water, that it may be all covered with water; and although that custom has grown out of use with most persons—for they do not wholly submerge the children, but only pour on a little water—yet they ought to be entirely immersed, and immediately drawn out, for this the etymology of the word seems to demand."

All the references to baptism, which can throw any light on this subject, correspond only with immersion, and no mention is made of any other "mode" for more than two hundred years after the death of our Savior. At that time Cyprian was asked what he thought "of those who in sickness and debility obtained the grace of God, whether they are to be accounted legitimate Christians, in that they are sprinkled, not washed, with the saving water." At this time baptism was deemed necessary to salvation, and the question was whether, in cases of necessity, when "sickness and debility" would not allow

immersion, those who were sprinkled were "to be accounted legitimate Christians." The question was not whether sprinkling was baptism. Every body knew it was not. Cyprian does not attempt to prove that sprinkling is baptism, but that, in the case supposed, "when need compels, and God vouchsafes his mercy, his compendious methods confer the whole benefit on believers." That is, according to Cyprian, when need compels God, he has "compendious methods," that is, abridged methods, methods summed up within narrow limits, by which to "confer the whole benefits on believers." His statement makes it clear that sprinkling, in his estimation, was not the divine baptism, but one of God's *compendious methods* of conferring benefits. He justifies this view by quoting a promise of God to the Israelites that he would sprinkle clean water on them, and by a reference to the law, when sprinkling was practiced for purification. His argument is that God will show mercy to the sick who can not be baptized, if they are only sprinkled, because he required sprinkling for purification under the law, and because he said he would sprinkle clean water on the Israelites and they should be cleansed. It is very remarkable that he does not pretend that sprinkling is the baptism enjoined, but that he admits that it is another, a "compendious" method of conferring benefits. He makes no reference to the New Testament, nor to any other use of the word baptize, to show that sprinkling was the authorized baptism. He knew it was not the baptism ordained by Christ, and, therefore, he did not claim that it was. As this is the oldest authority in the history of "the Church" which is quoted to prove that sprinkling was then considered the Apostolic baptism, I now affirm that *Cyprian never intimated that he regarded it as such, but that his own words show that he did not so regard it.*

He makes a clear distinction between sprinkling and this baptism, in these words:

"Or, if any think that they have obtained nothing, *in that they have only been affused with saving water*, but are still empty and void, they must not be deceived, and so, if they escape the ills of their sickness and recover, *be they baptized*. But if they can not be baptized who have been already sanctified by *the baptism of the Church*, why lay a stumbling-block as to their own faith or the mercy of the Lord?"

I farther affirm that, in the words quoted to prove that Cyprian regarded sprinkling as "a compend of baptism," there is no proof

of the fact alleged. He speaks of God's "compendious methods" of conferring benefits, but not of compendious methods of baptizing.

His views of baptism are thus expressed by himself: "*Dominus post resurrectionem mittens apostolos mandat et dixit. Data est mihi omnis potestas in cælo et in terra. Ite ergo et docete gentes omnes, tingentes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et spiritus sancti docentes eos observare omnia quæcunque præcepi vobis.*" That is: "The Lord, after his resurrection, when sending forth his Apostles, commanded and said: All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, immersing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you."

Again: "*Nam si non mentitur Apostolus dicens, quotquot in Christo TINCTI estis, Christum induistis; utque qui illic in Christo baptizatus est, induit Christum.*" That is: "If the Apostle lies not, when he says, As many of you as were *immersed* into Christ have put on Christ, then truly he who was then baptized into Christ has put on Christ." Such he knew to be the Apostolic baptism, of which sprinkling was not even a compend, an abridgment.

Dr. Dale says, page 346:

"If classic Greek pronounces a man who is *in a condition* of drunkenness to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of indebtedness, to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of intellectual imbecility, to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of obloquy, to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of grief, anger, or vehement desire, to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of profound stupor, to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of suffering from misfortune, or, from oppressive taxes, to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of mental perplexity, to be a baptized man; or, *in a condition* of disease, or under the influence of magical arts, to be a baptized man, then, I say, (although no instance may be found, either in the case before us, or in any other case, 'through all Greek literature,' where a man restored by any competent influence to religious purity, is said to be a baptized man, still,) any one who chooses thus to apply the term, (and to associate it with sprinkling as the act,) will have, in so doing, the unanimous support of every classic Greek writer through a thousand years."

This is very strange reasoning; but it is quite in accordance with the end aimed at from the very beginning of "Classic Baptism." All he has written was to prepare the way for this very paragraph. And now, since we have reached the very walls of brother Dale's Gibraltar, we propose to take it by storm.

I. He says: "If classic Greek pronounces a man who is *in a con-*

dition of drunkenness to be a baptized man," then any one who pleases may call any man who has been restored to religious purity a baptized man, and he will have, in so doing, the unanimous support of every classic Greek writer through a thousand years! The argument (?) is that the Greek writers said of a man who was, by the extravagant use of wine, immersed in intoxication and sleep; therefore, the man who is restored to religious purity is baptized!

2. That these writers said of a man who was immersed in indebtedness was baptized in debt; therefore a man restored to religious purity is baptized!

3. That the Greeks spoke of a man who was very ignorant as being immersed in ignorance; therefore a man who is restored to religious purity is baptized!

4. That as the Greeks said of a man who was much slandered, that he was immersed in slander; therefore a man restored to religious purity is baptized!

5. That as the Greek writers said of a man in great grief, anger, or vehement desire, that he was baptized, or immersed in these; therefore a man restored to religious purity is baptized!

6. That the Greeks spoke of a man who was narcotized by opium as being baptized in stupor; therefore a man restored to religious purity is baptized!

7. That Greek authors spoke of a man in deep misfortune, or overwhelmed with taxes, as baptized or immersed in, or by, them; therefore a man restored to religious purity is baptized!

8. That the Greeks said of a man immersed in perplexity was baptized in it; therefore a man restored to religious purity is baptized!

9. That, as the Greeks said that a man was overwhelmed by disease or magical arts; therefore a man restored to religious purity is baptized!

10. And that, although there is no instance in which any Greek author ever said that this restored man was ever baptized, yet the man who affirms that he has the "unanimous support of every Greek writer through a thousand years"; therefore sprinkling is baptism!

There is not one passage, in all Greek literature, which intimates that sprinkling is baptism; nor can a single passage be forced to mean any such thing. I now challenge brother Dale and all who recommended his "Classic Baptism," to produce such a passage, if they can.

The priests of Egypt performed a ceremony mentioned by Plutarch thus: "The priests in Egypt (ἐαυτοὺς περπαίνουσεν) *besprinkle themselves*, not with any water, but with that of which they believe that Isis drank"; but this is not called baptism.

To affirm that because the Greeks spoke of a man immersed in intoxication and sleep, as being baptized in them; of a man deeply in debt, as immersed in debt; of a man grossly ignorant, as baptized in ignorance; of a man greatly slandered, as immersed in slander; of a man in great grief, anger, vehement desire, as baptized or immersed in them; of a man narcotized by a drug, as baptized in stupor; of a man in great misfortune, or overwhelmed with taxes, as immersed in, or by, them; of a youth flooded with questions, and thus perfectly confused and embarrassed, as baptized, or immersed in perplexity; of a man overwhelmed by disease, or perfectly confused by magical arts, as baptized or immersed by them; *therefore sprinkling is baptism*, is the logic of brother Dale, by which he has gained all his fame as a writer on this subject.

Suppose we now say that a man who is "*in* a condition of drunkenness" is said, by the Greeks, to be sprinkled; that a man who is in a condition of indebtedness is a sprinkled man; that a man in gross ignorance is a sprinkled man; that a man in a profound stupor is a sprinkled man, etc.; would this express the "condition" of these men? If sprinkled would not express their condition, would their "condition" express sprinkling? And if neither can express the other, how can the one be the equivalent of the other? A man sprinkled by drunkenness is not very drunk; a man sprinkled by sleepiness is not very sleepy; a man sprinkled by indebtedness owes but little; a man sprinkled by ignorance is not very ignorant; a man sprinkled by grief will not be likely to die of it; a man sprinkled with stupor is not very stupid; a man sprinkled with misfortune is not very unfortunate. But if a man is baptized by, or in, them, the case is "reversed"; and this is the "condition" which the Greeks intended to express by *baptidzo*. Substitute the word *sprinkle* for *baptize*, in the Doctor's own examples, and in every case the passage becomes absurd. No other word but one which expresses the idea of immerse, or immersion, will answer the purpose of these Greek writers in a single instance. To express the *depth* of these "conditions," *baptidzo*, to immerse, and not *rhantidzo*, to sprinkle, was fully compe-

tent. There is no foundation for the Doctor's "condition" baptism in all Greek literature.

The Doctor's conclusion of the whole matter is, that WHATEVER IS CAPABLE OF THOROUGHLY CHANGING THE CHARACTER, CONDITION, AND STATE OF ANY OBJECT IS CAPABLE OF BAPTIZING THAT OBJECT, AND BY SUCH CHANGE OF CHARACTER, STATE, OR CONDITION, DOES, IN FACT, BAPTIZE IT.

Baptism is, then, a change of character, state, or condition! But in order to be this, the change must be a *thorough* change. When an infant is born its "condition" is thoroughly changed by its birth; therefore its birth baptizes it! And this, according to the Doctor, is not a baptism in figure, but "in fact." At puberty another thorough change of condition is produced by time and development. It is, therefore, baptized again by time and the laws of development. It falls in love, and has another change, both of condition and character, and is, therefore, again baptized. It marries, and thus thoroughly changes its condition, and is again, "by such change," baptized. Something produces dissatisfaction, and this person is divorced, which is another change of condition, or of state, and it is again, "by such change," baptized. It becomes thoroughly sick, and by this change of condition it is baptized! It recovers its health, and by this change is baptized again; or, it dies, and is, by that change, baptized! It was once an unbeliever, and became a believer, and by such change was baptized! It became penitent, and by that change was baptized. It afterward "fell from grace," and by that change was baptized! Every change in a man's life, from birth to death, both inclusive, is a baptism, if the change is thorough! And whatever produces these changes is a baptist! or a baptizer! Medicine is capable both of killing and curing, and is, therefore, capable of baptizing, and does, by the act, whether of killing or curing, baptize! Such are the absurdities to which our brother has been driven in order to prove that sprinkling is baptism; and yet sprinkling never did produce any thorough change in either character, state, or condition.

I have said that brother Dale started with the design to prove the doctrine contained in the above strange, and I may say, without any unkindness to him, the *absurd* proposition. This is clear from a sentence on page 21: "*Baptidzo* [I give the English letters] ex-

presses *any complete change of condition, by whatever agency effected, or in whatsoever way applied.*"

This is the doctrine of "Classic Baptism," which has given to it such wide circulation and high commendation. *Baptidzo* is an active, transitive verb; "change" is a noun; "of" is a preposition, and "condition" is a noun. An active verb can not "express" two nouns and one preposition. An active verb may be said to express the *doing* of something, but not the "condition" of any thing. It may express the *doing* of something which may result in a change of condition—the *doing* being the *cause*, and the "*change of condition*" the *effect*. But brother Dale makes *baptidzo* express a change of condition "by agency." This is making a verb "express" very much. Dr. Henry Green, of Princeton Theological Seminary, and Professor of Oriental Literature in that institution, says, in his "Critique:" "*The word describes a submergence, no matter how effected, and with no limitation as to the period of continuance.*" I have italicized this sentence to call special attention to it. If the Doctor and his friends will stand to this, we will ask no more. Submerge means to put under water, and "submergence," the Doctor's own word, means the being under water. Does he, and do his friends put their candidates under water when they sprinkle them? If they do not, then they do not do what "the word describes," and consequently they do not baptize them. If he prefers to put his candidates into a tub, and then pour or sprinkle water on them till they are submerged, be it so. But we suggest that a better way is to go with them "down into the water," and then submerge, or put them under the water. This is the way in which it was done in the time of the Apostles. In respect "to the period of continuance," we must stipulate that it shall not be so long as to drown the candidates; for it is written, "Thou shalt not kill."

Brother Green says farther, that "*the word passed in classic Greek to a secondary use, that of describing a condition of complete subjection to some controlling power or influence, particularly a ruinous destructive subjection.*" This certainly can not be what the Savior commanded, for he came not to destroy men's lives, but to save them. We are then driven back to the first meaning of the word—to "submergence." Sprinkling certainly will not coincide with this alleged secondary meaning of the word; for I think no person was ever destroyed by sprinkling. That would be worse than "dying by inches."

IV.—THE GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT—AN EXPOSITION OF ACTS II, 38, 39.

MEANING OF THE WORDS.

"THE gift of the Holy Spirit," as an expression, is only found *twice* in the New Testament—Acts ii, 38, where it is used by the Apostle Peter, and Acts x, 45, where it is used by the historian of Acts of the Apostles. There are two impressions that might be made on the mind of a reader from these words, looking at them abstractly. One is that the Holy Spirit "is the gift"; the other is that "the gift" is something *given* by "the Holy Spirit." We may say this watch is "the gift of the father" and this brooch "the gift of the mother" of John; thus the watch and the brooch are the things given by the father and the mother. But when a friend says John's father has promised him "the gift of the watch" and his mother "the gift of the brooch" when he returns from school well commended by his teachers, although the form of expression is changed so as to put "watch" in the place of "father" and "brooch" in the place of "mother" in the arrangement of words, still the idea is not changed as far as the *giver* is concerned or the *thing given*. The reason that we find no difficulty in the latter expressions is that we never predicate or assert of "the watch" and "the brooch" that they give, but we do and can assert of the father and mother that they give; hence the mind is not confused with the necessity of discriminating in that particular. The Holy Spirit "giving" gifts is not a Scriptural idea, although "manifestations" of the Spirit is. The phrase "gifts of the Holy Spirit"—Hebrews ii, 4, as found in the Common Version—has possibly given currency to the idea that there are "gifts" given by the Holy Spirit, or that the Holy Spirit gave the gifts. The word is not the same in the original in both cases. In Hebrews ii, 4, it would properly be rendered "distributions" or "parts"—that measure or portion of the Holy Spirit given to each, the "manifestations" of which were for the benefit of all—1 Corinthians xii, 7: "For to one is given *through* the Spirit a word

of wisdom, and to another a word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit." (Verse 8, etc.) Now, all these does one and the same Spirit effectively work, *distributing* to each respectively as it pleases. (Verse 11.) Hence the Apostle says, "We know only in *part*, and *prophecy in part*." (1 Cor. xiii, 9.) The expression, "Now, there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit"—1 Cor. xii, 4—does not state the "gifts" to be gifts given by the Holy Spirit, but that the diversities or varieties in the gifts and manifestations do not prove many, or various, or different spirits, "*but the same Spirit*." In the same way "the diversities of services" do not prove many lords, "but the same Lord"; and, even though there are "diversities of operations," there are not various or different gods, "gods many and lords many," as among the heathen, among whom are distributed the different powers, as the "goddess of wisdom," the "god of war," the "goddess of love," "but *it is the same God* who works all in all." (1 Cor. xii, 6.) Christ ascended on high, "captivated captivity, and gave gifts to men." (Eph. x, 8.) But the Holy Spirit is never said to "give"; it is said, however, that the Holy Spirit is "*given*," is a gift. "And when Simon saw that through the laying on of the Apostles' hands *the Holy Spirit was given*." (Acts viii, 18.) Hence, both from the form of expression and from the facts, we are led to the conclusion that the phrase "the gift of the Holy Spirit" denotes the Holy Spirit *given*, and not the Holy Spirit as the *giver* of a gift. There is an analogous phrase in Acts ii, 33—"The promise of the Holy Spirit"—which clearly means the Holy Spirit promised.

WHO, THEN, IS THE GIVER?

"But when the advocate is come whom I will send you from the Father, *the Spirit of truth who proceeds from the Father*, he will testify concerning me." (John x, 26.) The Apostles were "to wait for the promise of the Father" at Jerusalem. (Acts i, 4.) "This Jesus God has raised up, of which all we are witnesses; being exalted, therefore, to the right hand of God, *and having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father*, he hath shed forth this which you see and hear." (Acts ii, 33.) "And so is also the Holy Spirit whom God gave to those submitting to him." (Acts v, 32.) "*And God*, who knows the heart, bore witness to them, *giving them the*

Holy Spirit, even as he did to us." (Acts xv, 8.) It is quite clear that God is the giver of this gift. "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, descended from the Father of lights." (James i, 16.) What God is in these Scriptures alleged to have given is "the Holy Spirit." Peter says "the Holy Spirit" is a witness "whom God gave to those submitting to him," and he also alleges that God bore witness that the Gentiles should receive the Gospel, "*giving them the Holy Spirit, even as he did to us.*" There is no intimation anywhere that it was simply a miraculous power, but the Holy Spirit, of which the miraculous powers were "manifestations." The Holy Spirit was the gift given by the "Father of lights," and not something manifested as a consequence of the gift or as a work of the Holy Spirit. The "gift" was miraculous, and so, also, were the "manifestations" of the Spirit.

WHAT WAS GIVEN?

We ought already to be able to answer the question, What was given? Was it the Holy Spirit, or a manifestation of the Holy Spirit, otherwise termed a gift? We are forced by many facts and explanations to the conviction that the Holy Spirit was given. Not only the terms used indicate it, but every reference to it, both before and after the fact. First. What was promised? John says, "This he spoke of *the Spirit which they that believe on him were to receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given*, because Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii, 39.) Peter's quotation of Joel says, "I will pour out *a portion of my Spirit* on all flesh." (Acts ii, 17.) So Peter promised on Pentecost: "Repent and each of you be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit; for the promise is to you," etc. (Acts ii, 38, 39.) Now, this was what was promised before, and is identified with the Holy Spirit. Second. Luke's statement in reference to the Gentiles: "While Peter was yet speaking these words, *the Holy Spirit fell upon all* who were hearing the word, and they of the circumcision who believed, as many as came with Peter were astonished that *the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the Gentiles also.*" Peter said, "these *who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we.*" (Acts x, 44-47.) Here "the gift of the Holy Spirit" and the "receiving

of the Holy Spirit" are directly identified, and both are identified with the "giving" of the Holy Spirit to the Apostles. Third. Peter's explanation at Jerusalem of this gift to the Gentiles identifies it with the Holy Spirit: "And God, who knows the heart, bore witness to them, *giving them the Holy Spirit, even as he did to us.*" (Acts xv, 8.) Fourth. The express reference to what was given to the believers in Acts v, 32, is completely conclusive, and leaves no room for a doubt: "And so is also *the Holy Spirit whom God gave to those submitting to him;*" and this is the first allusion to the fact after the day of Pentecost.

WAS THE GIFT GENERAL?

The "Spirit of God" had not been given to mankind in the previous history of the world generally; only to a few. In the Patriarchal age it was not general; was not given to every one, or even to every one of a family or community, only to extraordinary persons for extraordinary purposes. In the Jewish age it was not given generally; only to the leaders of the people; rulers, priests, prophets, judges, and kings; and only to some of these classes. "God who in ancient times *spoke often and in various ways*, to the fathers, by the prophets, has in these last days spoken to us by a Son." (Heb. i, 1.) "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of private impulse, for never, at any time, was prophecy brought by the will of man; but holy men of God spoke, being moved by the Holy Spirit." (2 Peter i, 21. See 1 Peter i, 10, 11, 12; Neh. ix, 20-30.) "Then he remembered the days of old, Moses and his people saying: Where is he that brought them out of the sea with the shepherd of his flock? Where is *he that put his Holy Spirit within him?*" (Isaiah lxiii, 11.) It was said to be upon, or "come upon," or "clothe" persons in ancient times. (See Judges vi, 34; 2 Chron. xxiv, 20; xx, 14.) The expression in Gen. vi, 3, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years," does not necessarily intimate that an abstract power was exercised in striving with every man. Noah was a "preacher of righteousness." 2 Peter ii, 5: "And God testified against the Antediluvians 'by his Spirit in his prophets' for one hundred and twenty years." Neh. ix, 30: "Yet they would not give ear and they were destroyed." The question still presents itself, was the "gift of the Holy

Spirit" to be general and perpetual; to be given to each and every Christian of all times; during the Christian dispensation? To answer this satisfactorily the whole information upon the subject must be collected and laid before the mind. In addition to the prophecies of the Old Testament already referred to, especially that of Joel, we have promises in the New Testament, Luke's report of our Lord's saying: "If you then being evil, know how to impart good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give a Holy Spirit to those who ask him!" Luke xi, 13, need not be referred to, except to say that it is "a Holy Spirit," not *the Holy Spirit*, which Matthew states to be "good" gifts. (Matt. vii, 11. See Acts xv, 9.) John records a promise in these words: "He who believes on me, as the Scripture says, shall be like a cistern, whence rivers of living waters shall flow. This *he spoke of the Spirit, which they who believed on him were to receive*; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given because Jesus was not yet glorified." (John vii, 38, 39.) "And he said unto them, Go throughout all the world, proclaim the glad tidings to the whole creation: he who shall believe, and be immersed, shall be saved; but he who shall not believe shall *be condemned*. And *these miraculous powers shall attend the believers*; in my name they shall expel demons, they shall speak languages unknown to them before. They shall handle serpents with safety, and if they drink poison it shall not hurt them. They shall cure the sick by laying their hands upon them." (Mark xvi, 15.) These I think are all the promises we have in the Histories of Christ on the subject under consideration. These promises are again repeated on the great Pentecost: "And Peter said to them, Repent and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins, *and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit; for the promise is to you and your children, and to all that are afar off; as many as the Lord our God shall call*. And with many other words he testified and exhorted, saying, Save yourselves from this perverse generation." (Acts ii, 38, 39, 40.) These promises in Mark xvi, 17, and Acts ii, 39, are substantial equivalents. Our Lord said, "He that believes and shall be immersed;" Peter said, "Repent and be immersed." Our Lord said, "Shall be saved;" Peter said, "In order to the remission of sins." Our Lord promised, "These *miraculous powers shall attend the believers*;" Peter promised, "And

you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." This was a "miraculous" power or gift; it was not usual, it was not ordinary, it was not common to the saints of the Jewish dispensation. This was the cause or power which produced the others. (Rom. xv, 19.) The others were "manifestations" of this. Our Lord, as related by Mark, described the "manifestations." (See 1 Cor. xii, 8.) Peter promised "the gift," which would be the source of these manifestations. Where "the gift" was the "manifestations" were; and where the "manifestations" were not "the gift" was not. The manifestations were the outward and visible sign of the inward and invisible gift. Most speakers find no difficulty, when preaching the Gospel and quoting our Lord from Mark, in stopping at, "And these miraculous powers shall attend the believers"; although given them without any express limitations whatever; but when the same speakers quote Peter from Acts ii, 38, 39, their mistaken theory drives them to quote, "and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," and they stop there and leave out the express limitation used by Peter in connection with the promise when he made it. This may look to an unprejudiced observer as very odd; but it is, nevertheless, true. It shows, moreover, that the unreflecting acceptance of the stereotyped traditions of ecclesiastics has a wonderful power over minds otherwise candid and intelligent. No person should ever quote to a sinner that promise of Peter's without quoting the whole of it—the express limitation and all just as Peter did; then there would be a chance for the hearer not to be misled, although that is not very probable at the present day, without direct explanation, in consequence of the muddle and confused ideas which tradition and superstition has substituted in the place of the plain and simple declarations of the Scriptures.

This leads us to the consideration of

THE WORDS OF THE PROMISE.

Peter addressing a great multitude out of many nations told them certain marvelous facts which had transpired lately concerning Jesus of Nazareth; and also explained to them the character of the facts and the effect they were intended to have on the world. His hearers believe and ask "what shall we do," and he told them in answer

that they were to "repent and be immersed in the name of Jesus Christ in order to the remission of sins." This command they could all obey; there was no limitation to their power to do these acts which were commanded, and if the commands were obeyed the *consequence* was sure and certain. The "remission of sins" is stated as a consequence, a result of the obedience. It is not in the form of a promise, but stated as the effect of certain causes. He then changes the style, the change of idea or thought demanding it, and says: "*And you shall* receive the gift of the Holy Spirit;" he does not rest here. Without any thing farther in the connection or otherwise it might be claimed very reasonably that this promise was co-extensive with "the remission of sins"; but he proceeds and says, "for the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off." This is more extensive and has a wider range than the former words would indicate. It does not confine the "promise" to the obedient, but enlarges its boundaries to all present and "afar off," and to that generation and the succeeding one or more. Some theorists might step in here and claim that the passage is not quoted far enough when the stop is made at, "And you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit"; the other words should be quoted, and then all the world is included; notwithstanding our Lord said to his Apostles they would receive the Spirit of truth "*whom the world can not receive.*" (John xiv, 17.) The only safe way to deal with this as with all other Scripture is to hear it all, and what do we find? words of limitation, narrowing the boundaries, drawing in the circle; reducing the numbers; fixing and ascertaining the numerical total by words of number; "as many as," so many only; that number precisely; "*as many as the Lord our God shall call.*" This settles controversy. This sentence is pronounced and established the extent and number, the limit and boundary of the whole question. It is not general unless the call is general. It is, however, promised to a definite extent and for a definite number. How many? "*as many as the Lord our God shall call,*" to this promise, to this blessing.

HOW DID GOD CALL?

The call of God to the reception of "the gift of the Holy Spirit" was not by a voice from heaven, nor by the proclamation of the

Gospel, for that was to all mankind, but by means of the Apostles of Christ. We are not informed as to the facts with respect to those who were immersed on the day of Pentecost, although in Acts v, 32, we are told God *gave* the Holy Spirit before that time. We do not know how many, if any, received this gift on *that day* of Pentecost; we are only left to conjecture; and when I am left to that process in relation to religious matters I stop at once and proceed to analogous facts, if there are any to be found. In this particular we are not without facts. A little advance in the history informs us of one with numerous details that explains the whole difficulty. But before entering upon the consideration of that fact, we should remember that never again in all the discourses we have from the Apostles do we find this promise repeated to sinners or saints. We have remission of sins indicated as a result of the obedience to the Gospel in more than one instance; (see Acts v, 31; x, 43; xiii, 38; xxvi, 18;) but this promise of "the gift" is never again associated with it. This is significant, if not final, on the question. The fact, then, illustrative of how God called persons to the enjoyment of this gift is no exception. Philip the Evangelist preached to the Samaritans, (Acts viii.) They received the Word of God; they believed, and were immersed, were saved; their sins were forgiven. "*The Holy Spirit had fallen upon none of them*, only they were immersed in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts viii, 16.) If the promise of Peter on Pentecost was to have been general here was the occasion to find its fulfillment; but the fact being directly denied in this instance settles controversy on the subject, and shows beyond a doubt that the promise was not general, nor designed for each individual Christian. They did not "receive the Holy Spirit," which we have seen means the same thing as "the gift of the Holy Spirit"; for the Apostles having heard the news in Jerusalem that Samaria had received the Word of God, "sent Peter and John, who, when they came, prayed for them, *that they might receive the Holy Spirit.*" The Apostles did not pray for them to receive what they already possessed; and yet it was some time after they had been immersed; long enough at least for the news to go to Jerusalem, and for the Apostles to go to Samaria, which in those days must have been no inconsiderable time. "*Then they laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Spirit;*" and they had not received it until then. These simple statements of the

historian of Acts of Apostles at once and forever rebuts all theories or inferences about "the gift of the Holy Spirit" being given at, or as an immediate consequence of immersion.

We further read: "Now when Simon saw THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT WAS GIVEN BY THE IMPOSITION OF THE APOSTLES' HANDS," he offered them money, saying, "Give me, also, this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Spirit." The evidence accumulates as we read, and we find the question answered in express and explicit terms by the historian, when *he* (not Simon) says that "*the Holy Spirit was given by the imposition of the Apostles' hands*"; and in this way the call of God was indicated, or expressed: "In the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established."

Let us then turn to another testimony, (Acts xix.) Paul came to Ephesus, and finding there some disciples, he said to them. "Have you received the Holy Spirit since you believed? And they replied to him, No; we have not even heard if there be any Holy Spirit." Paul then explained to them the Gospel; "and hearing this they were immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus." So far the gift of the Holy Spirit was not given, although they had believed and had been immersed; "and *Paul laying his hands on them, the Holy Spirit came upon them*; and they spake with tongues and prophesied." "The Holy Spirit was given by the imposition of the Apostles' hands."

These facts ought to be satisfactory in explanation of the manner in which God called saints to the reception of "the gift of the Holy Spirit" in the Gospel dispensation. There is no fact in any aspect opposed to this. We have no details as to the manner in which the Holy Spirit was given to any saint in the New Testament other than these, unless it should be the "gift" given to Timothy, (2 Tim. i, 6;) and even in that case the same action was presented, the imposition of Apostles' hands. The Holy Spirit, nevertheless, was given in many other instances, as we find in repeated allusions in the Epistles, as, for instance, to the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Thessalonians; but we are obliged to conclude it was always given in the same way. This would seem to explain the Apostle Paul in his Epistle to the Romans, i, 11, when he said: "For I greatly desire *to see you, that I may impart to you some spiritual gift, that you may be established.*" His personal presence was necessary to that end, although it was

not necessary that he should be present to impart to them all the teaching, exhortation, comfort, and edification found in his Epistle to them. It is, moreover, clearly established that this gift was not general or universal; to all persons who obeyed the Gospel, to those only; to "as many as the Lord our God might call," by the "imposition of the Apostles' hands."

WAS THE GIFT TO BE PERPETUATED?

That "the gift of the Holy Spirit" was not to be perpetuated through all time is sufficiently shown from the fact that it was given "by imposition of the Apostles' hands," and that since the death of John the Apostle, the last Apostle of Christ, no such gift has been imparted. Since it was necessary for Paul, in his life-time, to see the Roman Christians to "impart some spiritual gift" to them, it can not be expected that after his death, and the death of all the Apostles, such gift should be imparted. The fact, too, that miracles have ceased, is proof positive and decisive that "the gift" has not been given since the Apostles' time, as the miracles were the "manifestations" of the Spirit and of power, and proved that what the Apostles spoke was the Word of God. (Mark xvi, 20; Acts xiv, 13; Rom. xv, 19; Heb. ii, 4.) Besides, we are told expressly that they were to cease. (1 Cor. xiii, 8.) The "gift of the Holy Spirit" was miraculous; the "manifestations" were miraculous; "the gift" was the foundation of all the others; the others the superstructure, showing where the foundation was. When "the gift" was not given, the manifestations were not seen, and when the manifestations are not seen we may reasonably conclude that "the gift" is not given; that, in fact, the perpetuation of "the gift" would perpetuate the "manifestations" of the gift; and as the manifestations are not perpetuated or continued, the gift is not perpetuated or continued. "But now these three continue, Faith, Hope, Love; but of them the greatest is Love." (1 Cor. xiii, 13.)

[It is proper to say that this article is published, not because its main conclusions are approved, but because it presents ably one view of a confessedly difficult subject.—EDITOR.]

V.—WUTTKE ON THE ETHICS OF CLOTHES.

(FROM THE GERMAN.)

THE natural perfection of the body is not yet the true, but is to be exalted from natural beauty to spiritual. As the spirit exists primarily only in a germinal form, hence, the body can not, from the very beginning, bear the full impress of the same; the spiritual expression of the body is, at first, not that of the personally formed, but only of the, as yet, impersonal, spirit in general. The expression of the countenance becomes really spiritual, truly beautiful, only by and through a personal character development, which is, in turn, reflected back from the personal peculiarity. The spirit must already have behind it a moral history, before it comes to expression in the features. A general beauty without character, is meaningless; a personally-spiritual beauty is winning and magnetic. The body becomes truly beautiful only through the complete appropriating of the same by, and for, the spirit; and the true secret of beauty consists in a genuine spiritual and moral culture. Where falseness has not yet gained a firm foothold, there the countenance is the mirror of the soul; and, for the skilled look, even disguising falseness is transparent. There lies at the basis of "physiognomics" a deep truth; but this truth is not expressible in definite words and lines. It is not by mere chance that, for certain historic personalities, such as those of Christ and the more prominent of the Apostles, certain very definite forms and casts of countenance have formed their place in Christian art, and by which every one recognizes them at first glance. The true character-expression of the cultured body is, as regards its sensuous representation, in some sense spirit-imbued, is sensuous and supersensuous at the same time; neither words, nor outlines, nor even the photographic pencil of nature, is capable of reproducing it, but only the spirit-guided hand of the artist; spirit is recognized and grasped only by spirit; no photograph of a spiritual, character-imbued face attains to the fidelity of an artistic portrait. In a sinless state, the beauty of the spirit

would necessarily reveal itself in beauty of body. So also must it have been in the case of Christ, and the erroneous notion that for a time prevailed in the early Church, to the effect that in Christ there had been no physical comeliness, was soon dissipated by the correct consciousness of Christian art. The heavenly soul of Christ must have depicted itself in his countenance—compare Psalm xlv, 3—and the reason why the children approached him with glad confidence and shouted, "Hosanna!" is doubtless because of a direct impression which Christ's person made upon them; children have a wonderful capacity for reading character in the external appearance. Female vanity, in laying such great stress on corporeal beauty, is guilty simply of applying to sinfully-perverted reality the thought, that it is correct for the unfallen state of humanity, namely, that beauty of body is evidence of beauty of the soul. The moral task, in relation to this culture of bodily expression, is happily not an immediate, intentional forming of the body, but the moral forming of the soul, which then, in turn, of itself impresses itself on the body.

The ornamentation of the body, including the exclusion of all uncleanness, is a very important moral duty, and one that is very definitely emphasized in Scripture. On the subject of nudity and clothing, there has been, both from the moral and from the artistic stand-point, much disputing. Greek art, in its golden age, represented some of the gods nude; at a later period, when it had stooped to the service of worldliness rather than of religion, it expressed itself predominantly in the nude. Still, however, only such gods appear nude as represent a certain degree of moral and spiritual unripeness or sensuousness; Jupiter, Juno, Minerva, appear almost always draped; in the case of spiritually developed and historical characters—also among human beings—nudity was an artistic impossibility. This suggests the true law in the case. Nudity represents merely the naturally beautiful, not the spiritually beautiful, merely the human in general, not the personal in particular—is that which is alike in all persons, not that in which they spiritually differ. That portion of the body which does not express the merely general, that is, the countenance, is, in fact, not veiled by clothing. It is the sense for the morally spiritual that gives a stronger expression to the personal, through the medium itself of clothing. Who could bear the thought of a nude Cæsar or Homer! Christian art rejected the

nude, for the good reason that it had spiritual characters to represent. Moreover, mere nudity is artistically beautiful only in the form of lust-repellant, colorless sculpture; in painting it becomes licentious and, therefore, unbeautiful. It is a very false opinion, that clothing really conceals beauty; clothing, as an expression of the spiritual, as a free artistic creation, is, in fact, the higher beauty. This appears very clearly when man is represented, not as an individual, but in a group; a bathing-place swarming with nude figures presents assuredly no beautiful spectacle, even if they were so many Apollos; precisely where man appears in his higher truth, namely, in society, there a beautiful scene is presented only by the help of diversified, character-expressive clothing. It is true, clothing is beautiful only where it is really expressive of a character, whether of the nation or of the person. The slavish copying after journals of fashion, is evidence of a want of sense and of character, and of a lack of æsthetic perception.

Clothing did not first become necessary because of sin. The Biblical account implies only that it became necessary prematurely, and for another than its normal reason, namely, before the development of personal character had led to its invention as an adornment. The sin of the first pair effected only that the hitherto innocent consorts felt, now, shame in each other's presence, and that clothing, the proper object of which is ornamentation, was turned into a garb of penance. Clothing was not the very *first* want of persons living, as yet, in the most primitive simplicity, nor was yet its lack the characteristic trait of the Paradisiacal state. Clothing would have become a moral requirement, also, in the unfallen state, so soon as man had grown into families, and the riper character of parents appeared in the presence of children, (compare Gen. ix, 21, sqq.) The nudity of savages is not innocence, but shameless rudeness.

Animals do not decorate themselves, they are decorated already. Man exalts himself above the animal by ingenious decoration. The tawdry ornamentation of savages exemplifies this under a rude form. With them the mere changing of the natural form is regarded as a beautifying; the notion of ornamentation is conceived under an essentially negative form; the unnatural itself is regarded as beautiful. There is a higher significance in the hunter's hanging about himself the skins of the bear or lion; this is to him essentially a deco-

ration of honor, a sign of his courage. Thus, also, in the simple forms of civilized life, it is an honor for a woman personally to weave and to prepare her own clothing and that of the family; it is natural for man to display his work, the fruit of his skill, to his fellows; but he also loves to manifest his spiritual idiosyncrasy under an æsthetic form, in the ornamentation of the body. Clothing, and ornamentation in general, when of a normal character, manifest, in part, the general element, the natural peculiarity, and, in part, the personal peculiarity; hence, in the manner of the clothing, we can, to a certain degree, recognize the personal character. The distinction between male and female clothing, among all civilized nations, has a deep moral ground, (compare Deut. xxii, 5;) and just as, on the one hand, it is usually foolish and vain for an individual to break entirely with a general national custom, so, on the other, it is evidence of spiritual imbecility to make one's entire outward appearance a piece of mere imitation, without personal peculiarity.

The Scriptures attach some importance to a befitting adornment, and view it especially in its moral significancy. Jehovah himself prescribes a worthy garb for those who officiate in his worship. (Ex. xxviii and xxix; Num. xv, 38, sqq. :) a holy adornment becomes those who offer worship to the Lord, (Psalm xxix, 2; compare Ex. xix, 10; Ezek. xxiv, 17.) When Christ in his parable (Matt. xxii, 2, sqq.) characterizes the not putting on of the wedding garment as a serious fault, he manifestly does more than allude to a mere worthless custom, (compare Gen. xli, 14;) and the Apostle does not consider it unimportant to commend to the societies a becoming adornment, (1 Tim. ii, 9, 10.)

That cleanliness of body and of clothing is regarded not only in the Old Testament, (Exodus xix, 10; xxix, 4; Lev. viii, 6; Num. viii, 6, *seq.*; xxxi, 21, *seq.*; compare Prov. xxxi, 25,) but also in all the higher heathen religions and in Islamism, as an important moral and religious duty, so that, in fact, a large part of the worship consists of washings, with direct symbolical reference to moral purification, is a plain indication of the deep moral significance of bodily purity. The sanitary interest is here merely incidental; the essential point is the outward expressing of the spiritual. Man is to bear in his entire inner nature, as well as in his outward manifestation, a spiritually moral impress; is to be, in all respects, an expression of free self-

determination; is to have upon himself nothing which has attached itself to him merely outwardly or fortuitously, as something belonging not to him, but to an extraneous nature-body; is to be a purely spiritual creation. Uncleanliness is the expression of unfree nature-existence, of a dependent, passive belonging to mere outward nature, an evidence of self-abandonment, self-disesteem, and dishonor, and is regarded, among all cultivated nations, as a symbolical and actual indication of sin; it has never been any thing other than isolated spiritual perversions of humanity who have found an especial wisdom and greatness of soul in an open display of uncleanness. Sensual pleasure-seeking, riotousness, and moral degradation usually lead to corporal filthiness, and it is a very wise principle of education in the case of the morally abandoned, and in missions among rude tribes, to place a very high value on bodily cleanliness. The precepts as to cleansing in the Old Testament are based on this ground; Christianity expressly declares carefulness about outward cleanliness as a virtue intimately connected with religion. (Matthew vi, 17; compare John xiii, 4, *seq.*)

VI.—OUTLINES OF THE HISTORY OF IMMERSION AND SPRINKLING.

THAT the Founder of Christianity instituted a rite called baptism, to be observed by all who would be his followers, is simply undeniable. That this rite, whatever it may be, was in some way connected with water, and was intended to be observed as long as the Gospel should be preached, is equally undeniable. That the action performed in this rite, as instituted by Christ and observed by his Apostles and the early Christians, was an entire immersion of the body of the subject in water, is the uniform testimony of all standard writers of all Churches, ancient and modern. Further, according to the New Testament, penitent believers only are proper subjects of this ordinance.

How, then, are we to account for the present extensive departure from the primitive form of this ordinance, both as to the subject of

it, and *especially* the action performed in the administration of it? If an entire immersion of the body in water was the action of baptism in the days of Christ and the Apostles, how long after their time did it continue to be the action? When, by whom, by what authority, and for what reason, was immersion changed to something else? Affusion (sprinkling, pouring, or whatever else than immersion is ever used for baptism) is practiced by many now instead of immersion. How long has it been thus? When was the change introduced? and by whom? Why, and by whose authority? If, in the light of history, these queries can be satisfactorily answered, then we shall be able to see where all the true friends of Christ, in justice to themselves as well as to their Savior and his cause, ought to stand on this question. Of course nothing more than the briefest outline of this history can be attempted in this paper. And we shall not attempt the formality of a regular, consecutive discussion of, and answer to, each of the above questions; but in what follows they all will be answered, and in the quotations made we shall see what is the verdict of impartial history on them, each and all. First we note,

THE PRACTICE OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

But what is the Greek Church? In the reign of the Roman Emperor, Constantine the Great, early in the fourth century, (about A. D. 312,) Christianity became the by-law-established religion of the Empire. Various causes (slowly operating at first) conspired at length to give to the Bishops of Rome a supremacy over all other Church dignitaries, which eventually resulted in developing the Papacy. But in the East events were taking place which ultimately developed a formidable rival to the Roman Bishops. The Patriarch of Rome (as the Bishop was then called) was now acknowledged as supreme, or, as Mosheim says, "the Prince of the Patriarchs." The Bishop of Constantinople was elevated to the position of the second patriarch of Christendom. This, with the political division of the Empire into the Eastern or Greek, and the Western or Latin Empires, together with other causes, at last separated the Christians in the East from those in the West, forming thus the Greek and the Roman (Catholic), or the Eastern and Western Churches.

The practice of these Eastern Christians—the Greek Church—

with reference to the *action of baptism*, is what we are now specially interested to know. Nor is it an unimportant matter to know this; for the command to "baptize" was originally recorded in the language spoken by these very people—in Greek. The word "baptize," together with its whole family of derivatives, is Greek; and certainly the practice of Greek Christians, from that day to this, should be no mean commentary on the meaning of the word. If they do not, whom can we expect to understand it? Without stopping to quote authorities to sustain a point that no one familiar with history will deny, it is affirmed that the practice of the Greek Church for eighteen centuries has been *immersion*. Some of the "Greek Fathers" thus speak of the ordinance:

Cyrill, Bishop of Jerusalem, who flourished in the fourth century, says: "As Jesus, assuming the sins of the world, died, that, having slain sin he might raise thee up in righteousness, so, also, thou, going down into the water, and in a manner buried in the waters as he in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life." Again, he says: "And in the same ye *died* and were *born*, and that saving water became to you a *grave* and a *mother*."

Basil the Great, who also flourished in the fourth century, says: "The water presents the image of death, receiving the body as in a tomb."

Chrysostom, who flourished in the latter part of the fourth, and in the beginning of the fifth century, says: "Divine symbols are therein celebrated, burial and deadness, and resurrection and life. And all these take place together; for when we sink our heads down in the water, as in a kind of tomb, the old man is buried, and sinking down beneath, is all concealed at once; then, when we emerge, the new man comes up."

To the same effect we might quote Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Theophylact, Hippolytus, and others. We will only give further on this point the statement of the learned Pedobaptist, Professor Stuart, of Andover. He says: "The mode of baptism by immersion the Oriental (Greek) Church has always continued to preserve, even down to the present time. The members of this Church are accustomed to call the members of the Western Churches *sprinkled* Christians, by way of ridicule and contempt. They maintain that baptizo can mean nothing but immerge, and that baptism by sprink-

ling is as great a solecism as immersion by aspersion ; and they claim to themselves the honor of having preserved the ancient sacred rite of the Church free from change or from corruption, which would destroy its significancy."

Having seen that the practice of Greek Christians, who certainly ought to know the meaning of their own language, has always been uniformly and unanimously *immersion*, we ask, how it has been in other countries and in other Churches? Let standard Church historians tell us the practice of the centuries.

Of the first century Mosheim says: "Baptism was administered in this century without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an *immersion of the whole body* in the baptismal font." Of the second century he says: "The persons that were to be baptized . . . were *immersed under water*, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the *express command* of our blessed Lord." During the third century he intimates that the action of baptism was the same, but that several additional ceremonies were associated with it.

Of baptism in the fourth century one historian tells us: "Baptismal fonts were now erected . . . for the more commodious administration of that initiating sacrament. From other sources we learn that these "fonts," or baptisteries were, until the sixth century, constructed in separate buildings, erected for the purpose. They were either built over running streams, or water was conveyed into them in pipes. Afterward they were introduced into the Churches themselves. There are old churches in Europe to-day—both Catholic and Protestant—where such a ceremony as immersion is now never seen—that *still have these old baptisteries*—a standing monument to the ancient practice, which has been abandoned, and, therefore, also a standing monument of the folly and shame of those who have accepted a human device in place of a Divine command.

Neander, one of the greatest of ecclesiastical historians, informs us that "baptism was originally administered by immersion ; and many of the comparisons of St. Paul allude to this form of its administration—the immersion is a symbol of death, of being buried with Christ—the coming forth from the water is a symbol of a resurrection with Christ ; and both taken together, represent the

second birth, the death of the old man, and a resurrection to a new life."

William Cave, an English Church historian of considerable eminence in the seventeenth century, in a work entitled "Primitive Christianity," thus speaks of baptism: "The party to be baptized was wholly immersed, or put under water, which was the almost constant and universal custom of those times, whereby they did more notably and significantly express the three great ends and effects of baptism; for, as in immersion there are, in a manner, three several acts, the putting the person into the water, his abiding there for a little time, and his rising up again, so, by these were represented Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; and in conformity thereunto, our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life."

Though it might easily be done, we will not consume space by pointing out from history the specific practice of each individual century with reference to the action performed in the rite of baptism—rather we will rest the whole matter, as to the practice of the Church through the ages, on the statements and admissions of affusionists themselves.

Vossius, an eminent critic, philologist, and theologian of the seventeenth century, says: "That the Apostles immersed whom they baptized there is no doubt. . . . And that the ancient Church followed their example is very *clearly evinced* by *innumerable testimonies* of the Fathers."

A writer in the "Encyclopedia Ecclesiastica," giving the history of the ordinance, says: "It is evident that, during the first ages of the Church, and for *many centuries afterward*, the practice of *immersion* prevailed; which seems, indeed, never to be departed from, except where it was administered to a person at the point of death, or upon the bed of sickness, (which was considered, indeed, not as giving the party the full privileges of baptism,) or when there was not a sufficient supply of water. Except in the above cases, the custom was to dip or immerse the whole body. Hence St. Barnabas says: "We go down into the water full of sin and pollutions, but come up again bringing forth fruit; having in our hearts the fear and hope which is in Jesus."

Dr. Wall, himself a Pedobaptist, who diligently explored the

ancient writings in search of evidence for infant baptism, thus honestly testifies: "This (immersion) is so clear and plain, by an infinite number of passages, that, as one can not but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so we ought to disown, and show a dislike of, the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Antipedobaptists merely for the use of dipping; when it was, *in all probability*, the way by which our blessed Savior, and for *certain* was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. 'Tis a great want of prudence, as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is *certainly true*, and may be *proved* so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest one says."

One more eminent Pedobaptist—Professor Stuart, of Andover Theological Seminary—we will hear testify as to the Scriptural action of baptism, and the practice of centuries subsequent to the times of the Apostles. He says: "*Bapto, baptizo*, mean to dip, plunge, or immerge into any liquid. *All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this.*" "The man that denies that immersion was practiced in the primitive Church for *several centuries* after the Apostles must possess great want of candor or be unacquainted with Church history. *It is a thing made out.* So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly and certainly 'made out. I can not see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this."

Now, what we are specially interested to know at this point is for how long a time immersion continued to be the action of baptism. Several of these Pedobaptist writers have unequivocally declared that immersion was the Scriptural and primitive practice, and that it was continued "for many centuries afterward"—"for several centuries after the Apostles." We might cite scores of testimonies from a similar source to the same effect, but it is unnecessary, for they all tell the same story. But again the question comes, *For how long a time* did the Christian world adhere to the primitive rite, and thus continue to deserve in this respect the approbation of the Apostles* for keeping the ordinances of the Gospel as they delivered them? Let Pedobaptist writers tell us this, too. Says Bishop Bos-

* 1 Cor. xi, 2.

suet: "We are able to make it appear, by the acts of councils and by the ancient rituals, that for *thirteen hundred years* baptism was thus administered [by immersion] throughout the whole Church, as far as possible." By an Episcopalian writer—Floyer—we are told that "the *English Church* practiced *immersion* down to the beginning of the *seventeenth century*." A standard Catholic writer—Brenner—declares: "Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the immersion of a man under water, and only in extraordinary cases was sprinkling or affusion permitted. These latter methods of baptism were called in question, and even prohibited." This shows what a Catholic writer was compelled by facts to admit, in direct contradiction, too, to the practice of his own Church at the time, which every-where practices sprinkling, and even forbids immersion, with perhaps an exception in favor of the Churches in one European city—Milan. Dr. Whitby—Episcopalian—also records that immersion was religiously observed by all Christians for *thirteen centuries*. He further avers that the change of it into sprinkling was without any allowance from Christ, any authority from the Apostles, or any license from any council of the Church. He then adds: "It were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use." Many similar testimonies there are, but only one more will we tax the reader with here, and that again from the pen of Stuart: "From the earliest ages of which we have any account subsequent to the apostolic age, and downward for several centuries, the Churches did generally practice baptism by immersion. . . . The only exceptions to this mode . . . were in cases of urgent sickness, or other cases of immediate and imminent danger, where immersion could not be practiced. . . . Aspersion and affusion, which had, in particular cases, been now and then practiced in primitive times—after the middle of the third century—were *gradually introduced*. These became . . . quite common—in the Western Church almost universal—some time before the (Lutheran) Reformation. In what manner, then, did the Churches of Christ, from a very early period, . . . understand the word *baptizo* in the New Testament? Plainly, they construed it as meaning immersion. They sometimes even went so far as to forbid any other method of administering the ordinance, cases of mercy and necessity alone excepted. . . . We are left in *no doubt* as to the more generally received

usage of the Christian Church down to a period several [thirteen] centuries after the apostolic age."

We now propose to show that the practice of those Churches which now use sprinkling or pouring for baptism was, in the earliest part of their existence as Churches, *immersion*, and *immersion only*. This is true, at least, of the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches. The Church of England—Episcopalian—came off from Popery about A. D. 1534. The circumstances connected with the origin of this Church are well known to those familiar with that part of English history connected with the reign of Henry VIII. Until his time, and, indeed, through a part of his reign, Romanism was the religion of England, and Henry himself was a zealous Catholic, a noble son of "the Church." In earlier life, while yet a Papist, he burned William Tyndal, one of the first and greatest of the English reformers of the sixteenth century, and an eminent translator of the New Testament. He also wrote a work in denunciation of Luther and his work, and in defense of Catholicism, for which the Pope dignified him with the title "Defender of the Faith," a title still worn by the English sovereigns. But at length, because the Pope would not give his permission for Henry to divorce his wife and queen, Catherine of Arragon, in order to marry Anne Boleyn, Henry threw off all allegiance to Rome, and declared himself the supreme head of the Church of England. Now that he had established a Church of his own, of which he declared himself the head, as the Pope was the head of the Church of Rome, he reformed some of the abuses of Popery, and retained some. But what we are principally concerned in now is the fact that for near a century this new Church—English or Episcopal—practiced *immersion for baptism*. Immersion was even enforced by the civil law. These facts will clearly appear in the following quotations. The first English "Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments," published in 1549, during the reign of Edward VI—about fifteen years after the origin of the Episcopal Church—has the following: "Then the priest shall take the child in his hands and ask the name, and, naming the child, shall dip it in the water thrice, first dipping the right side, second the left side, the third time dipping the face toward the font, so it be discreetly and warily done, saying: N, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy

Ghost. Amen. And, if the child be weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words." Revisions of this book made in 1552, 1559, and 1604 respectively, have substantially the same direction. In the revision of 1662 the form is: "Then the priest shall take the child into his hands, and shall say to the godfathers and godmothers, Name this child. And then, naming it after them—if they shall certify him that the child may well endure it—he shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily, saying: N, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. But if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words." And so the direction stands to-day in the ritual of "the United Church of England and Ireland" as at present used. In the same ritual, in the form given for "the ministration of baptism to such as are of riper years, and able to answer for themselves," the priest is directed to "take each person to be baptized by the right hand, and placing him conveniently by the font, according to his discretion, shall ask the godfathers and godmothers the name, and then shall *dip* him in the water or pour water upon him, saying," etc. Nothing is clearer from history than that the Church of England—an offshoot from Popery, as already described—at her first organization, in 1534, did, as their own authors abundantly assert, teach, require, and practice immersion. History, the rituals of that Church, and the act of Parliament already referred to, all show this. For about one hundred years the struggle went on before immersion was put aside and a substitute adopted in its place. As late as 1640 very many in the Episcopal Church were very reluctant to give up immersion and take affusion, and, indeed, would not do it until compelled to do so by a law of Parliament.

In an excellent work, entitled "Letters on Christian Baptism," published about thirty years ago by Rev. J. F. Bliss, it is stated that "the original law of 1534 enforced immersion, and those who were not baptized were to be treated as outlaws. The act of Parliament of 1644 repealed so much of the old law as enforced immersion, and enforced sprinkling in its stead, and left the original penalty annexed to sprinkling. After this, those who were not sprinkled were to be treated as outlaws, . . . being deprived of the right of inheritance of estate, the right of burial; and, in short, of all the

rights secured to the other *sprinkled* citizens of the realm." On another page the same writer says: "After 1648, immersion was prohibited, and for many years made penal."

Sir John Floyer, a physician of eminence, in an address to some of the dignitaries of the Episcopal Church, says: "I do appeal to you as persons well versed in the ancient history, canons and ceremonies of the Church of England; and therefore are sufficient witnesses of the matter of fact which I design to prove, namely, that *immersion* continued in the Church of England till about the year 1600. And from hence I shall infer that if God and the Church thought that practice innocent for *sixteen hundred years*, it must be considered an unreasonable nicety, in this present age, to scruple either immersion or cold bathing as dangerous practices. . . . The Church of Rome uses only the wafer for the supper, and instead of *immersion* they introduced *aspersion*." He adds: "I have now given testimony from our English authors to prove the practice of immersion from the time the Britons and Saxons were first baptized, till King James's days, about 1600; when the people grew peevish with all ancient ceremonies, and then the love of novelty, the nicety of parents, and on the pretense of modesty, they laid aside immersion."

Dr. Johnson, speaking of the Popish custom of withholding the cup from the laity, observes: "I think *they are* as well warranted to make *this* alteration in *that* ordinance, as *we* are to *substitute sprinkling* in the room of *ancient baptism*."

In 1707 Dr. Gale made the following declaration: "It is *notorious to every body*, that the divine ordinance, within *less than a hundred years*, has been *discarded*, and something totally unlike it has been *substituted*." The Presbyterian Church first began in England not far from 1541, an outgrowth or offshoot from Episcopacy, and the Congregational (Independent) Church, originated soon after.

Now, it is a well-established historical fact, yet a fact that is with great care withheld from the people generally, that, for nearly a hundred years in England, *immersion was the general practice of these Churches*. Immersion, in Presbyterian and Congregational Churches, even, continued to be the common action of baptism, until the Westminster Assembly, in 1643, by a vote of 25 to 24—a majority of one—laid aside immersion and adopted a man-made substitute in its stead, which, being ratified by Parliament the suc-

ceeding year, became, of course, a divine ordinance! The fact, as above stated, is notorious and undeniable.

This action of the Westminster Assembly is narrated by many writers. The following are some of the statements of the matter. A. Haldane's version of it is this: "In the Westminster Assembly, it was decided that dipping of the person in water is not necessary; but baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. This decision was, however, carried by a majority of one, there being 25 for it and 24 against it."

Robinson's statement of the matter is as follows: "Dr. Lightfoot was the man who caused dipping to be excluded, and sprinkling to be declared sufficient in the Assembly of divines, 1643. On the motion 'The minister shall take water and sprinkle or pour it with his hand upon the face or forehead,' the vote came to an equality within one."

In some other quotations yet to be made, the fact of the change from immersion to sprinkling being effected in this Assembly, will be still further confirmed by good Pedobaptist authority. Now, however, will the reader permit a citation from the *Enc. Amer., art Baptism*. The writer says: "In the time of the Apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel with the words which Christ had ordered. . . . The immersion of the whole body was omitted, only in the case of the sick who could not leave their beds. In this case sprinkling was substituted, which was called clinic baptism. The Greek Church . . . retained the custom of immersing the whole body; but the Western Church adopted in the 13th [14th?] century the mode of baptism by sprinkling, which has been continued by the Protestants, the Baptists only excepted. *The introduction of this mode of baptism was owing to the great inconvenience which arose from the immersion of the whole body in the northern climates of Europe.*" "Murder will out," is an old saying. So, too, truth "will out," sooner or later; if religious teachers so called won't tell it, secular writers will, as in this case. But how shall we, without seeming rudeness or uncharitableness, characterize a spirit which first deliberately perverts a command of God—an ordinance of Christ—and then denies all knowledge of the perversion, insisting that this substitute is the divine command itself? This brings us to the

HISTORY OF SPRINKLING.

The baptism (so called) of Novatus is the first one on record in which the act performed was any thing else than immersion—the first one that differs in the action from that commanded by Christ, and universally practiced so far as history informs us, up to this time, A. D. 253. This Novatus was, as was supposed, on his dying bed, and it being judged imprudent or impossible to baptize him, water was poured over him as he lay upon his bed. Eusebius, “the father of ecclesiastical history,” gives the following account of this transaction: “Novatus . . . fell into a grievous distemper; and it being supposed that he would die immediately, he received baptism, being besprinkled with water on the bed whereon he lay—if *that*,” adds he, “*can be termed baptism.*” He further says: “This baptism was thought imperfect and not solemn, for several reasons. Also, they who were thus baptized, were called ever afterward, *clinici*; and, by the twelfth canon of the Council of Neocesarea, these *clinici* were prohibited the priesthood.”

This case occurred about the middle of the third century, and thus was more than two hundred years too late to have received any warrant from Christ, and one hundred and fifty too late for any from the Apostles. The first *public notice* of any such act as a substitute for baptism, is said to have been more than half a century later still, at the Council of Neocesarea; and there it was *noticed* only to be *condemned*. “But,” asks an objector, “did not infant baptism begin in the third century?” We cheerfully answer—yes. But infant baptism then was not, in the action, what infant baptism is now, as we know it. It was uniformly immersion—baptism—not mere rantism or sprinkling.

The first known case of infant baptism is given, substantially, as follows in Bliss’s “Letters:” “One Fidus, a minister of the Gospel in Africa, was surrounded by people who had been long accustomed to sacrifice their babes in a heated brazen statue. So strong was their delusion that it seemed impossible to hinder them from destroying their children in the flames, supposing they were doing the gods good service. They even sometimes stole and sacrificed the babes of Christians. But on account of the civil law, they dared not to meddle with persons that had been baptized. Fidus, under these

circumstances, devised the scheme of immersing the babes in the name of the Trinity. They then were regarded as, or at least took the name of Christians, and were safe. On laying the matter before a council, a decision was given in favor of Fidus's course on two grounds: first, 'God would be a respecter of persons, if he denied to infants that which he grants to adults;' secondly, 'Elisha lay upon a child and put his mouth upon the child's mouth—the spiritual sense of which is that babes are equal to men; and you destroy this equality if you refuse to baptize them.'" This is the first demonstrable case of baptism of babes, and this was immersion. The custom *did* begin in the third century without a doubt, but so also did many of the errors and abominations of Popery.

We wish specially to emphasize the fact that this infant baptism of the third century was not the infant baptism of the Churches in the United States in the nineteenth century; that it was *infant immersion*; that in the Greek Church has always been, since it began, and is to-day *infant immersion*; that among all others who practiced it at all was almost, if not quite, universally *infant immersion* until the fourteenth century, and that the Episcopal ritual even now directs the priest, in the case of either infant or adult baptism, after praying to God to "sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin, and grant that this child—or the persons—now to be baptized *therein* may receive," etc., to—if the candidate is a child—"dip it in the water discreetly and warily," unless he shall be assured that the child is weak; if the candidate is an adult, the administrator is directed to "dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying, I baptize thee," etc. When Pedobaptists talk of the antiquity of infant baptism they should be honest enough to admit the undoubted and undeniable facts above stated.

The preceding quotations show, in part, at least, how, when, and why infant baptism began. Another brief testimony—from the *Encyclopædia Americana*, article *Baptism*—will throw additional light on this matter: "Some converts delayed their baptism from a feeling of sinfulness not yet removed; others did the same from a wish to gratify corrupt desires a little longer, and to have their sins forgiven all at once. But the doctrine of St. Augustine—fourth century—that the *unbaptized* were *irrevocably damned* changed this delay into haste, and made the *baptism of children general*." While, therefore, in the

Scriptures only penitent believers are spoken of as subjects of baptism, we are now able to understand how and why the rite has been changed in this respect. The heresy of "baptismal regeneration" has, in all probability, had more to do with the perversion of baptism as to the proper subject than any or all other causes combined; and wherever infant baptism so called is practiced now, whether it is known or not by those who practice it, *there is still left a strong taint of that heresy.*

The following are a few of the many adducible testimonies showing the origin and history of the other corruption of baptism—*i. e.*, as to its action. First we will hear Dr. Wall. He says: "All those nations of Christians that do now or formerly did submit to the authority of the Bishops of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling. The English received not this custom—sprinkling—till after the decay of Popery. *But all other Christians in the world, who have never owned the Popes usurped power, do and ever did dip.*"

The testimony of Dr. Gale is not less pointed and clear: "All men know that baptism was used to be administered in England by dipping or immersion till Queen Elizabeth's time—1558—since which time that pure, primitive manner is grown into a total disuse within a little more than one hundred years, and sprinkling, the most opposite to it imaginable, introduced in its stead. The fact is notorious."

In the New Edinburgh Encyclopædia—*article Baptism*—edited by Sir David Brewster, a Presbyterian, the statement is made that immersion was the ancient baptism, and the writer then adds: "The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner. Pope Stephen II, being driven from Rome, fled to the usurper of the crown of France, in 753. While there certain monks inquired of him whether baptism performed by pouring water on the head of an infant would be lawful. The Pope replied that it would. But, though the truth of this fact should be allowed—which, however, many Catholics deny—yet pouring and sprinkling were admitted only in cases of necessity. It was not until the year 1311 that the legislature in the Council of Ravenna declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In Scotland, however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases till after the Reformation—Lutheran, sixteenth century—and in England even in the reign of Edward VI—from 1547 to 1553—trine immersion was commonly practiced."

But now we approach the time when the foundation was laid for the change which was made in the Westminster Assembly, as already described. Queen Mary, "of bloody memory," succeeded Edward VI, and while she sat on the English throne Bishop Bonner's rigid execution of her sanguinary decrees against non-conformists drove many exiles to the continent, where some of them made the acquaintance of the Reformers at Geneva, at the head of whom stood Calvin. When Elizabeth succeeded Mary, in 1558, these exiles returned, and reported in Scotland and England that "the famous, godly, learned man, John Calvin, had *improved on baptism* (!), and this *substitute* was not *half so troublesome*." From that time "this substitute" began slowly to be used. Seeing how much more convenient it was, and how much less humiliating to both administrator and candidate, the proud, persecuting bishops of the time set themselves to have immersion put away, and sprinkling substituted as a baptism good enough for them. They began and kept up a discussion of the matter, the proud, worldly, and carnal, and those without much respect for the sacred authority and institution of the Savior falling in with them, while the more humble, honest, and conscientious opposed. The Bishops even preached before Parliament, trying to incite them to pass a law that should enforce sprinkling. They urged the matter in such terms as these: "The devil of immersion ought to be legislated out of the realm, it is so troublesome." It was during the feeling and excitement consequent on these discussions of the Bishops that what is known as the "Bishops' Bible" was published. Growing out of their desire and determination, if possible, to have the divine ordinance of baptism put aside and a human substitute put in its place, many perversions of passages relating to this ordinance found their way into the "Bishops' Bible." Nearly half a century later, when King James's translators sat down to their task, it was under these, among other restrictions: "Keep as close as possible to the Bishops' Bible. The old ecclesiastical words must be kept." When, therefore, we read the authorized translation on the subject of baptism, we are to remember that on this subject it retains those perversions—the very translations—of those Bishops who were so anxious that "the devil of immersion should be legislated out of the realm," being so exceedingly troublesome.

The account in the article of the Edinburgh Encyclopædia, before

quoted, is in harmony with the foregoing. Says the writer: "During the persecution of Mary—1553 to 1558—many persons, mostly Scotsmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that—Presbyterian, Calvin's—Church. In 1556 a book was published at Geneva containing 'the form of prayers and ministration of sacraments approved by the famous, godly, learned man, John Calvin,' in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin, and returning to their own country, with Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland [by authority of John Calvin!]. From Scotland this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the Established Church," as we have already seen, for nearly a century after this. The same writer further declares: "*John Calvin was the first man among Protestants that changed the ordinance.*"

We are told by historians both when and why he made the change. It was in the year 1556. There being that year a great number to be baptized, to expedite the matter he first devised the practice of drenching the candidate by pouring over him a pail of water; this being more convenient than immersion. Afterward he used a less quantity, and finally merely sprinkled, or laid a little water on the forehead of the subject. Dr. Wall (himself a Pedobaptist, Episcopalian), in describing the matter, says: "Pouring was the substitute for baptism which Calvin first adopted, and *his sprinkling* was only the *substitute of a substitute*, and was the most scandalous thing ever adopted for baptism."

We can now appreciate fully Calvin's meaning when he says: "The Church hath granted to *herself(!)* the privilege of somewhat altering the form of baptism, retaining the substance; that is, the words."(!) A Bishop (Smith) of the Episcopal Church in Kentucky, declared that "the bowl and sprinkling are strictly Genevan in their origin; that is, were introduced by Calvin at Geneva." Wall states the same fact in these words: "The Presbyterian Church in Geneva is the first Church on earth that ever *enjoined* sprinkling."

How, in the face of such declarations as the foregoing, nearly all of them, too, from Pedobaptists, any man can suppose affusion to be

of Divine origin, or can even suppose it to be for a moment allowable among those who love and fear the Lord and reverence his Word, is, I confess, a great mystery. The corruptions of the institution of baptism, referred to in this paper, have done more toward corrupting the Church itself than any of us will know till we look back at the events of time in the light of the eternal world. And to-day the current perversions of this ordinance in some quarters are a greater hinderance to Christian union than any other, perhaps than all other things combined. There is, and must be, an "irrepressible conflict" upon this subject until the authority of Jesus is recognized as supreme. There can be, there ought to be, no compromise on the part of those who stand by His truth, in favor of the practice of those who pervert that truth.

In preparing this paper the writer has not aimed at originality, but only to present, in as brief a form as possible, the authentic utterances of historic writers, mainly in their own words. The number of testimonies might be greatly increased without perhaps adding to the force of the argument. Dr. Hall particularly, than whom, perhaps, no writer is better qualified to testify, speaks very fully and very pointedly of the change of this rite, both as to the subject and the action. His declarations we would like to give to the reader; but as they would only corroborate the witnesses who have already testified, we forbear, only remarking that if men will not heed the numerous witnesses who have spoken with reference to this matter, "neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

We have now seen how baptism has been changed as to its form and subject, or, rather, as baptism—a command of the Lord can not be *changed* except by Him who gave it—it is more correct to say that baptism was generally observed by the whole Christian world (with the exceptions named in our quotations) for thirteen centuries, and then deliberately discontinued by some, and by more and more gradually, until, in some quarters, it is no more seen.

We have seen that a Romish Council, early in the fourteenth century, decided that baptism might be practiced, or that, instead of it, something that Christ never spoke of, nor commanded, might be substituted in its place—it being indifferent which is done.

We have seen that even Catholics, who invented the substitute,

and first *permitted* its use, practiced immersion, as a general rule, till near (some say after) the time of the Lutheran Reformation.

We have seen that, so far as Protestants are concerned, Calvin was the first to lay baptism aside, and *enjoin* sprinkling in its stead. Wall says that, except in case of necessity, "*basins were never used till used by Presbyterians.*"

We have seen that sprinkling was first introduced into Scotland and England by returned refugees from Geneva about 1558, but that in England, at least, even then, it did not begin to be generally practiced for nearly a century more, and only did become general after the Westminster Assembly, by a vote of 25 to 24, threw away baptism, and put sprinkling in its place, securing the aid of civil law to enforce the change. Wall says that, in England, "sprinkling, at 1645, was just beginning, and was used by very few."

We have seen that the Episcopal, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches—the strongest among Protestants that practice affusion except the Methodist*—in their early history practiced baptism, but afterward laid it aside, and took what Wall calls "the substitute of a substitute."

We have seen how frivolous and pitiful are the reasons alleged for this change. *Popery, John Calvin, the Westminster Assembly, and the British Parliament, are all the authority beneath the heavens for the practice of affusion.* The conclusion of the whole matter is—IMMERSION IS BAPTISM, NOTHING ELSE IS.

*The Methodist Church did not have its origin till after this change had been made in the above-named Churches; and as she was an offshoot from Episcopalianism, brought along with her the rite which the Episcopal Church had then come to use instead of baptism.

VII.—NATURE OF THE OFFICE OF THE PRESBYTERY.

INASMUCH as the term presbyter and its cognate titles are applicable severally to the Apostles and their subordinate associates, we propose to designate both these orders of officers by these various names.

Our inquiry in this paper relates to the official import of these titles. Why are apostles and their subordinate associates called elders, bishops, or pastors?

1. In answering this question it requires no time to show that the office designated by these terms is to be distinguished from the *diaconate*. While apostles, and the subordinate order called elders, are spoken of as *deacons*, the deacons, officially so styled, are never called elders or apostles.

And even granting that a department of the diaconate was admitted to a share in the councils of the presbytery, their position therein significantly indicated that the deacons were not officially entitled to an equal and authoritative participation in its deliberations. This distinction has its origin in the language of Holy Writ. In Philippians i, 1, it is clearly recognized in the salutation of the Apostle to the "*bishops and deacons*." He also draws a line of positive demarkation between these officers in his instructions to Timothy. After describing the qualifications requisite in a bishop, he adds: "*likewise must the deacons*," etc. (1 Tim. iii, 8.)

The office of deacon was subordinate to that of presbyter. Dr. Angus says the deacons "formed with the pastor a band of presbyters, to whom the general management of the community was committed." (Prize Essay, Christian Church, § 3, 48.) But where is the proof? The latter takes precedence in the order in which they are named, "bishops and deacons." (Phil. i, 1.) The Apostle Paul in one instance uses language which many interpreters understand to mean that deacons were properly candidates for promotion to a higher office in the Church: "They that have used the office of a deacon well purchase to themselves a *good degree*." (1 Tim. iii, 13.)

Mosheim, alluding to this passage, observes: "Learned men have

been led to conclude, and apparently with much reason, that those who had given unequivocal proof of their faith and probity in the capacity of deacons were after awhile elected into the order of presbyters.* He also informs us that it was usual for the early Churches to fill a vacancy in the Presbytery "from among the deacons."† Clemens, of Alexandria, A. D. 200, thus distinguishes between elders and deacons: "Just so in the Church, the *presbyters* are intrusted with the *dignified* ministry; the *deacons* with the subordinate."‡

2. In the second place, in primitive times, the office of elder was not identical with that of *teacher*. Ministers of the word were not necessarily elders of the Church. There were persons in the Church whose services were confined to teaching, and who were known by the name of Teachers, as the distinctive designation of their specific functions.

Accordingly we read (Eph. iv, 11) that among the various gifts to the Church there were "pastors and *teachers*." "He that teacheth" is directed to "wait on his teaching," and that "ruleth" to do so "with diligence." (Rom. xii, 8.) Again, "God hath set some in the Church; first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly *teachers*." (1 Cor. xii, 28.) We also learn that "there were in the Church that was at Antioch certain prophets and *teachers*; as Barnabas, and Simeon that was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen, which had been brought up with Herod the tetrarch, and Saul." (Acts xiii, 1.) But *teacher* and *elder* are not necessarily convertible terms.

The opinion that "pastors and teachers" (Eph. iv, 11) are only different terms descriptive of the same office is without countenance in the Scripture.

It is true that among the elders there were those who labored in word and doctrine; but it is easy to suppose such persons united in themselves two offices, that of ruling and teaching. Thus, in our day, we make a distinction between a minister and a pastor. Though every pastor is supposed to be a preacher, yet every

* Hist. Christianity, First Three Centuries. Cent. I, § xlv.

† Ibid., Cent. I, § xxxix.

‡ Stromat, lib. 1. And before him Hermas had spoken of "*the presidents of the Churches*. Then such as have been set over inferior ministries, and have protected the poor and the widows."

preacher is not supposed to be a pastor. Nor do we understand by a pastor merely a preacher, ministering officially to a given Church. The pastoral office we all understand to mean *watch-care*, oversight, and hence often discriminate between the qualifications of a person as pastor and preacher. Modern pastors unite in themselves some of the features of two offices that, according to the New Testament, were distinct.

No doubt in the Apostolic age two or more offices were sometimes united in one person. The Apostles were endowed with several; Philip, "one of the seven," was also an evangelist. (Acts xxi, 8.) Some of the elders labored "in word and doctrine," (1 Tim. v, 17;) and it was certainly required that a bishop be "apt to teach." (1 Tim. iii, 2.) Yet these facts do not prove that the offices of teaching and ruling were identical, nor that every teacher was empowered by virtue of his office also to govern. The elders of the synagogue were chosen at one time from among the scribes and Pharisees, and the Sanhedrim was composed of selections from among the priests, scribes, and elders;* yet it does not follow that all the priests, scribes, and elders of the nation were elders of the synagogue or members of the Sanhedrim.

The existence of the office of presbyter, as distinct from that of teacher, was clearly recognized by the Jews. In Jer. ii, 8, we read, "The priest said not, Where is the Lord? and they that handle the law knew me not: the pastors† also transgressed against me, and the prophets prophesied by Baal." Here are mentioned four separate classes of officers—priests, teachers, pastors, and prophets. Other instances wherein pastors are spoken of in the Old Testament indicate the governmental character of the signification of the word. "That saith of Cyrus, He is my *shepherd*," ποιμην (poimeen). (Isa. xlv, 28.) Here a king is compared to a shepherd or pastor. So also Ezekiel xxxiv, 23, 24: "And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, and he shall be their *shepherd*. And I the Lord will be their God, and my servant David a prince among them." (Comp. Jer. iii, 15; x, 21; xii, 10; xxii, 22; xxiii, 1.) The title of Rabbi likewise was never given to an elder of the Jews, but only to a teacher of the law: "They said unto him Rabbi (which is to say, Master)"—(literally, teacher, *didaskalos*.)

* Jahn's Archæology, § 244.

† Septuagint, ποιμην, *poimeen*.

This distinction continued to be observed for a long time in the early Church. While doubtless those who were called *elders* preached, yet there was a class of persons called teachers, who did not act the part of elders. Thus, Dionysius of Alexandria, A. D. 260-268, speaks of having called together the "elders and teachers of the brethren in the villages."*

The distinction thus asserted between the office of teacher and presbyter was acknowledged in the early polity of Churches that have now lost sight of it. The early Puritan Churches had elders that were not necessarily teachers, and teachers that were not necessarily elders. There is extant a celebrated treatise on Ecclesiastical Polity, whose authorship is ascribed to the joint efforts of "Mr. Thomas Hooker, late *pastor* of the Church at Hartford, and Mr. John Mather, now *teacher* of the Church in Boston."† In this book it is argued that to the *elder* belongs "ruling only as elders," and that "ruling and teaching pertain to the elders only as uniting in themselves the two offices of "*pastors* and *doctors*." A creed statement of Congregationalism, published about 1700, says that, in addition to other officers, "in every Church there should also be a *doctor*, to instruct and catechise the ignorant in the main principles of religion."

The view of Dr. Hackett is, that "the presbyters or bishops were *not, by virtue of their office*, teachers or preachers at the same time; nor, on the other hand, were the two spheres of labor incompatible with each other."‡

Neander also observes that the presbyters "were originally chosen as in the synagogue, not so much for the instruction and edification of the Church as *for taking the lead in its general government*."§ Elsewhere he remarks that

There is a distinction between "pastors and teachers, inasmuch as the qualifications for the outward government of the Church were different from those which were requisite for the guidance of the Church by the preaching of the Word. The first belonged especially to the presbyters or bishops who stood at the head of the organization for the outward government of the Church. Certain it is, at least, that they did not all possess the gift of teaching, as *διδασκαλοί*, *teachers*. On the other hand, these may have been persons endowed with the gift of teaching, and qualified thus to be teachers, who still belonged not to the class of presbyters."||

* Euseb., B. vii, c. 24. † Summe of Church Discipline. In Two Parts. A. D. 1648.

‡ Com., Acts xiv, 23.

§ Planting and Training of the Church, p. 35.

|| Introduction to Coleman's Apostolic Church, p. 16.

3. These quotations from Neander anticipate the formal statement of the real nature of the office of the presbytery. Primarily and pre-eminently it was one of *government*. The elders were the authorized and authoritative rulers of the Church. It was their duty to superintend its interests, give direction to its movements, and enforce its laws:

"Of the officers concerned in Church government, the next in rank to that of the Apostles was the office of overseers or elders, more usually known (by the Greek designations) as bishops or presbyters." "The office of the presbyters was to watch over the particular Church in which they ministered in all that regarded its external order and internal purity. It was their duty to promote, to the utmost of their ability, and by every means within their reach, the spiritual good of all those committed to their care."*

Several considerations may be adduced to show that the office of the presbytery, in the Primitive Church, was one of *government*.

1. Such is the *historical import of the earlier* ELDERSHIP. The use of the word to designate an *authority* occurs in the records of the patriarchal age, and also of other nations besides the Hebrew.

In Genesis xxiv, 2, we read that "Abraham said unto his eldest servant of his house, that *ruled* over all that he had." The more correct rendering is "his servant, the elder of his house," etc. When Joseph "went up to bury his father, with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh; the elders of his house and all the elders of the land of Egypt." (Gen. l, 1.) In allusion to this same class we are told by the Psalmist (cv, 22) that Pharaoh gave to Joseph authority over his house, "to bind princes at his pleasure, and teach senators wisdom."

We read, also, that the *elders* of Moab and the *elders* of Midian came unto Balaam and spake unto him the words of Balak. (Num. xxii, 4.) That the official character of these elders was one of authority is sufficiently manifest in verse 21: "And Balaam rose up in the morning and saddled his ass, and went with the princes of Moab." In verse 35, these same persons are called "the princes of Balak." The Gibeonites while negotiating with Joshua make an allusion to their elders as persons in authority. (Joshua ix, 11.)

The existence of elders among the Hebrews doubtless had its origin in the patriarchal age. We read of them as constituting an

* Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of Paul*, vol. i, pp. 433, 434.

order well known and long established among them, during their bondage in Egypt: "Go and gather the elders of Israel together." (Ex. iii, 16.) In Ex. xix, 7, we learn that before going up into the mount, Moses "called for all the elders of the people." On his return from the mount he assembled before him these same persons and addressed them as "the *rulers* of the congregation," (xxxiv, 31.)

When the administration of affairs imposed too heavy a tax upon the energies of Moses, the Lord instituted an order of elders, whose special duty was to assist Moses in the government of the people. "Go gather unto me seventy men of the elders of Isarel, whom thou knowest to be the elders of the people, and officers over them; and bring them unto the tabernacle of the congregation, that they may stand there with thee. And I will come down and talk with thee there; and will put it upon them, and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone." (Num. xi, 16, 17. Compare Ex. xviii, 1, 2, 3; Deut. i, 16, 17.) In the exercise of their prerogative, we read that on a certain occasion "Moses with the elders of Israel, commanded the people, saying," etc. (Deut. xxvii, 1.) That the Jewish elders so frequently spoken of in the New Testament were persons in authority, rulers of the people or of the synagogue, will hardly be called in question by any one acquainted with its contents. Indeed, in every instance where the term elder designates office among the Jews—whether reference is had to "the elders of the people," (the heads of tribes and of families,) to "the elders of the city," or to "the elders of the synagogue," its invariable signification is that of authority, of rule.

To the Jewish mind, therefore, the import of this word and office was intelligible and familiar. And inasmuch as this term was transferred to the first Christian Churches—Churches composed altogether of Jews—and applied to certain officers also without any intimation of a modified meaning, the most natural conclusion is that the Jewish Christians recognized in such an officer of the Church, a person clothed with functions similar to those belonging to an elder in the older economy. It can not be supposed that the Holy Spirit would have permitted the sacred writers to have employed a term to designate an officer in the Church that represented the idea of an authority which the Head of the Church never instituted. If, therefore, we had no farther proof, we should feel justified in concluding

that the term "elder," as applied to an officer in the Christian Church, had the same import that it had when used to designate an officer in the Hebrew polity, whether civil or religious. It is incumbent upon any who call in question the correctness of this view, to furnish explicit proof that the New Testament use of the term "elder" is, in its application to the Church, different from that known among the Jews from the beginning of their history.

2. But we rely not merely upon the *usus loquendi*. In the second place the *terms* that are used to describe the *DUTIES* which the New Testament imposes upon the presbytery, prove that the office was one of *government*.

In 1 Cor. xii, 28, we read that "governments" are among the gifts which God has bestowed upon the Church. The existence of such an office necessarily implies the creation of one or more officers to whom the gift of government shall belong. Accordingly, we learn that "he that ruleth" must rule with diligence. (Rom. xii, 8.) Nor are we left to conjecture to whom this duty belongs. Including the above instance, the word *προϊστημι*, *proisteemi* (to rule) is employed eight times; once as above and four times with special reference to the duties of elders in the Church. 1 Tim. iii, 4, 5: "A bishop must be one that *ruleth* well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. For if a man know not how to *rule* his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?" 1 Tim. v, 17: "Let the elders that *rule* well be counted worthy of double honor." 1 Thess. v, 12: "And, we beseech you, brethren, to know them which are among you and are *over* you in the Lord."

In each of the above quotations the *italicized* portion is the translation of the same Greek word *προϊστημι* (*proisteemi*.)

Again, we read Heb. xii, 7: "Remember them which *have the rule over* you." 17: "Obey them that *have the rule over* you." 24: "Salute all them that *have the rule over* you."

In these passages the phrases in *italics* are, severally, translations of the Greek word *ἡγεομαι*, *hegeomai*, which Robinson renders "*to be a leader, chief*." The leadership, however, implied in the word is not that of influence merely—it is that of authority. This will appear if we notice other instances of its use in the New Testament. Matt. ii, 6: "Out of thee shall come a *Governor*, the Messiah." Luke xxii, 26: "He that is *chief* is as he that doth serve." Here "*chief*" is the

antithesis of "serve." Acts vii, 10 (referring to Joseph): "And he [Pharaoh] made him *governor* over Egypt and all the house."

The cognate noun *ἡγεμών* (*hegemon*) occurs in the New Testament twenty-two times; of these it is translated once "princes," (Matt. ii, 6); twice "rulers," (Mark xii, 9; Luke xxi, 12); and nineteen times "governor"; of these last instances, seventeen have direct reference to the Roman Governor of Judea; e. g., Matt. xxvii, 3: "They led him away and delivered him to Pontius Pilate *the governor*."

The fact that the Apostles would designate a class of officers in the Christian Church by a term with which was associated the idea of such kind of civil authority as was vested in a Roman Governor, is strong proof that the office thus indicated was one of GOVERNMENT.

3. The title of *ἐπίσκοπος*, (*episcopus*), bishop, by which, also, the elders are designated, contains in its import the idea of authority. The word means, as we have said, OVERSEER. The elders of the Church at Ephesus are thus admonished: "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you OVERSEERS." (Acts xx, 28.) "This representation," says Olshausen, "is not favorable to the view now widely diffused among Protestants, that the ancient constitution of the Church was completely democratical."*

The same thought is expressed in 1 Pet. v, 2: "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder. Feed the flock of God which is among you, TAKING THE OVERSIGHT THEREOF"—*ἐπίσκοποι οὖντες*.

4. PASTOR is another name for *shepherd*. The Church is compared to a "flock," and the duty of the elders is to "feed the flock of God." (1 Pet. v, 2; Acts xx, 28.)

The verb translated "feed" is *ποιμαίνω*, *poimaino*, a cognate of *ποιμην*, *pastor*. It has properly a more comprehensive signification than our English word "feed" seems to imply. Feeding sheep, strictly speaking, is only a part of a shepherd's duty, and when applied to a shepherd is to be taken in the largest sense; just as when we say that the farmer's work is *to plow*, or of a soldier *to fight*. The verb means "*to tend flock*;" and since *giving food* is only a part of the general oversight and care which a shepherd exercises

* Com., *in loc.*

over his flock, so mere instruction is only a part of those duties which belong to a pastor in *feeding* the Church of God.

The office of shepherd is one of control and authority over the sheep; but it is the authority of affectionate interest. He governs with a view to promote the well-being of the flock. In a like manner the pastor is to *feed* the Church. He is to keep "the flock of God."

Such is the opinion of OLSHAUSEN. He asserts that the phrase *ποιμαίνεν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ* (*feed the Church*) proves that "the pastoral care of the Church includes alike the GOVERNMENT and teaching of the Church."*

Neander remarks, "The term *ποίμνες* (pastors) denotes exactly the office of RULERS of the Church, the presbyters or bishops; it therefore does not appear evident that we should class the *διδασκαλοὶ* (teachers) with them."†

HACKETT says, "*ποιμαίνεν* (*poimainein*) includes the idea not only of instruction but of GOVERNMENT and SUPERVISION in general."

But we do not ask the reader to rely altogether upon the authority of great names. The Word of God furnishes illustrations of the use of this Greek word in connections that will convince any person of ordinary intelligence that its proper signification is to *govern*.

The first passage we quote will doubtless strike the mind of the English reader as favoring the opposite of the view we maintain:

"And I will give you PASTORS (poimenes) according to mine heart, which shall feed you with *knowledge* and *understanding*." (Jer. iii, 15.) A right construction of the original requires us to understand the *italicized* phrase to indicate, not the substance with which they shall feed the people, but *the character of their administration*. They shall feed you INTELLIGENTLY—the Arabic version has it "prudently."‡ In the other passages in the Old Testament, where *pastors* are spoken of, Gill and other commentators understand the special reference to be to kings, princes, and other earthly potentates; *e. g.*, Gill thus comments on the following passage: 2 Sam. v, 2, "Thou shalt FEED my people Israel; and thou shalt be a captain over Israel"—"as a shepherd feeds his flock; hence kings were frequently called shepherds, and David particularly." (Comp. 2 Sam. vii, 7; Ezek. xxxiv, 23.) Jer. x, 21: "The PASTORS are become

* Com., Acts xx, 28.

† Neander, *Planting and Training Church*, p. 95.

‡ Gill, *in loc.*

brutish;" "The *kings* of Judah—though it need not be restrained to these only, but may include all inferior *magistrates*, and even all ecclesiastical *rulers*." Jer. xii, 10: "Many PASTORS have destroyed my vineyard;" "heathen princes." (Comp. xxii, 22; Isa. xlii, 28.)

Let us now turn to the New Testament. Ποιμαίνω, *poimainō*—the word under discussion—occurs eleven times, but only in one instance is the literal and English idea of *feeding* specially indicated. This is in Jude 12—"feeding themselves without fear." Here, however, the verb is in the middle voice, or used in the reflexive sense—taking care of them. In every other case it is used transitively, and clearly involves the notion of *government*.

Twice it is employed literally: "a servant plowing or feeding cattle;" that is, tending cattle. (Luke xvii, 7.) The like import belongs to the word in 1 Cor. ix, 7—"who feedeth a flock and eateth not."

In eight instances it is used metaphorically; of these it relates four times to the bestowment of pastoral care over the disciples of Christ: John xxi, 16; Acts xx, 28; 1 Pet. v, 2; Rev. vii, 17; and four times to the exercise of *princely authority*: Matt. ii, 6, "He shall *rule* my people Israel;" Rev. xi, 27; xix, 15, "He shall *rule* them with a rod of iron," instead of the ordinary shepherd's crook; xii, 15, "who was to *rule* all nations with a rod of iron;" Rev. vii, 17, "in the midst of the throne shall *feed* them."

Still further, other words occur in the New Testament that signify the imparting of *nourishment*, to the entire exclusion of the idea of *government*; and if the true import of the pastoral office is merely that of a teacher it would seem highly probable that the Holy Spirit would have selected one of these terms in preference to that one which makes *teaching subordinate to GOVERNMENT*. There are five such: Βοσκω,* *Boskō*, "to pasture, to instruct;" Ποιζω,† *Potizo*, "to give to drink;" Τρεφω,‡ *Trephō*, "to nurse, to nourish;" Χορταζω,§ *Chor-*

* It occurs nine times: Matt. viii, 30, 33; (Comp. Mark v, 11, 14; Luke viii, 32, 34;) "many swine feeding;" "and they fed them." Luke xv, 15: "He sent him into his field to feed swine;" and, in order to emphasize the idea of instruction rather than government, the Savior selects this word in John xxi, 15, 17, "Feed my lambs;" "Feed my sheep."

† Potizo is employed fifteen times, but is translated by the verb "feed" only once: 1 Cor. iii, 2, "I have fed you with milk."

‡ Found eight times. It is rendered by the verb to feed thrice: Matt. vi, 26, "Behold the fowls of the air; your Heavenly Father feedeth them;" Matt. xxv, 37, "When saw we thee an hungered and fed thee;" Rev. xii, 6, "Where she hath a place prepared of God, that they should feed her there."

§ Chortazo is used fifteen times. It is usually translated by the verb "to fill;" once by

tazo, "to feed with grass, to satiate, to satisfy;" *Ψωμιζω*,* "to feed by morsels." But to multiply words is needless. The New Testament itself defines its own meaning in this direction: "FEED the Church of God." Paul immediately adds, "over which the Holy Ghost hath made you OVERSEERS," (Acts xx, 28;) and Peter explains in what sense the elders were to perform this duty, "by TAKING THE OVERSIGHT THEREOF." (1 Pet. v, 1, 2.)

In fine, the true idea of the pastoral office is exemplified in the character of the Lord Jesus Christ. He is "the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls." "He is the Good Shepherd." He furnishes illustrations of the fitness of the title. He came into the world not simply to be a *teacher*, but to prove the reality of his character as a *shepherd*. "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine, and I lay down my life for the sheep." He owns and governs the sheep, he loves them, watches over them with a tender solicitude, he protects them from all dangers, he leads them into "green pastures and beside still waters," he gives his life for the sheep. The sheep know him, they recognize his voice, acknowledge his authority, and trust in his love. Pastors are the under-shepherds of the flock—governors, under Christ, of the Church of God.

III. In the third place, the kind and arrangement of the *qualifications* requisite to the office of an elder or bishop, prove that it is one of *government*. These qualifications are given in detail in 1 Tim. iii, 2-7, and Titus i, 6-10. A reference to these catalogues will show that while capacity for teaching is, indeed, mentioned, yet a talent for "preaching," in the formal sense of that word, is not insisted upon as the chief characteristic. A skillful master-builder ought to be competent to perform the several services requisite to the erection of a building, but this ability does not constitute his special and higher qualification. It is certainly important that a military general understand the various maneuvers of the drill, but it is not a logical consequence that herein lies his special fitness for commanding an army. Just so he who would occupy the responsible position of a bishop in the Church of God, ought certainly to be thoroughly the verb "to feed;" Luke xvi, 21, "Desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the man's table."

* *Psomizo* occurs three times. Rom. xii, 20, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him;" 1 Cor. xiii, 3, "And though I bestow (*psomizo*) all my goods to feed the poor."

versed in the great truths of the Gospel, and able to unfold and defend them; but it does not follow that every good teacher in religion is qualified to be a bishop, or that the highest requisite in the character of a bishop is an aptness "to teach."

In corroboration of this view we quote the language of NEANDER: "Although the overseers of the Church took cognizance not only of the good conduct of its members, but also of that which would be considered as forming its basis, the maintenance of pure doctrine, and the exclusion of error; and though from the beginning care would be taken to appoint persons to this office who had attained maturity and steadiness in their Christian principles, it did not follow that they must possess the gift of teaching, and in addition to their other labors occupy themselves in public addresses."*

In looking at these qualifications *as a whole*, they present a complete picture of a competent ruler in the Church of God. First and chief he must have proven his capacity for the office of a bishop by the maintenance of a good family government; then follow the requisitions of vigilance, sobriety, good behavior, hospitality (of disposition), aptness to teach and exhort, self-control, benevolence (of spirit), humility, and a good reputation. Possessing these traits he will be "blameless." Now any one can see that the combination of these characteristics, though eminently desirable in every one, as high exemplification of Christian character, is indispensable to a complete realization of the official fitness of a ruler in the Church. They constitute the *tout ensemble* of a Christian bishop.

IV. The peculiar injunctions given to the brethren in their relation to their elders, afford further proof of the doctrine of presbyterial authority. They are required to entertain for their elders a high degree of deferential regard. "And we beseech you, brethren, to *know* them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord and admonish you, and to *esteem them very highly in love*, for their work's sake." (1 Thess. v, 12, 13.)

Among the meanings belonging to the verb translated "know," Robinson gives "*to know and approve*," "*to love*," "*to care for*," "to take an interest in." We speak of knowing God, that is, of recognizing his character and authority. Knowing not God, is described as a condition of bondage to sin: "Howbeit when ye *knew not* God, ye

* Planting and Training Church, p. 96.

did service unto them which by nature are no gods." (Gal. iv, 8.) "They profess that they *know* God, but in works they deny him." (Titus i, 16.) "Saying, *Know* the Lord: for all shall *know* me, from the least to the greatest." (Heb. viii, 11.) The brethren were to know their rulers as the soldier knows his commander, as the citizen knows his magistrate, as the child knows his parent—to love, honor, and obey them.^c

More than this, they are to "esteem them very highly in love." This phrase is a translation of a compound form which means "*above what is more than enough*," ἐκπερισσοῖ, ekperissoi. It occurs in one other place in the New Testament: "Now unto him that is able to do *exceeding abundantly above* all that we can ask or think." (Eph. iii, 20.) Assuredly this is strong language, and its use can be accounted for on no theory so naturally as that which recognizes the position of the parties referred to as one of authority in the Church. The spirit of this injunction is to be interpreted in the light of the *emphatic* allusions found in the context. Evidently the Apostle is seeking to correct some abuses in the Church, and has in his mind the conduct of persons, whose fault consisted in the exhibition of a spirit directly the opposite of that he herein inculcates; for he immediately adds, "And be at peace among yourselves. Now we exhort you, brethren, to warn them that are unruly," (verses 13, 14.) The marginal reading "disorderly" for "unruly," does not impart the force of the argument. Classical usage employs the word to express the disobedience of a soldier—one who breaks from his ranks and disregards the order of his commander.

To the same effect are the directions given in Heb. xiii: "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: whose faith follow." (verse 7.) "*Obey* them that have the rule over you and *submit* yourselves." (verse 17.) "I beseech you brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas that it is the first-fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,) that ye *submit* yourselves unto such and to every one that helpeth us and laboreth." (1 Cor. xvi, 15, 16.) "*Salute* all them that have the rule over you."

These passages require no elaborate explanation. They are their own interpreters. "Obey" and "submit" are correct translations of

the original, and have, hence, the full force that is ordinarily implied in their use. They indicate the response on the part of the ruled to the appropriate exercise of that proper authority, which the head of the Church has vested in those who rule. They admit of no explanation that does not accept as *prima facie* the division of the Church into two classes, the *ruled* and the *rulers*, those whose duty it is to yield obedience and those whose duty it is to "rule well."

These directions can not be made to harmonize with those forms of polity that resolve the organization of the Church into an absolute democracy. A society, all of whose members, officers, and laity are officially equal, contains no conditions to which directions to those *who rule* and those *who are ruled* are appropriate.

The only authority to which such organizations profess to owe obedience and submission is the formal action of a majority of members that are assembled at a given time.

V. That the elders were the governors of the Church is also indicated in the peculiarity of the caution that is given to them: "*neither as being LORDS over God's heritage.*" They are cautioned against *over* ruling. They are not to exercise the prerogatives of their office for the purpose of self-aggrandizement. They are forbidden to intrench upon the rights of conscience, to impose needless, or questionable, or burdensome measures, or to enforce the just administration of their authority, in the spirit of harshness, vanity, or indifference. They are to govern under Christ with a constant regard to the wishes, weaknesses, and well-being of the brethren. Such we conceive is the import of this caution. But the propriety of giving it presupposes their possession of an office, whose abuse would consist in an unseemly display of prerogative. The elders are to *rule*, not to *tyrannize*.

VI. In addition to the above Scriptural proofs of this doctrine, we remark that the allusions to the office of the presbytery in the writings of the earlier fathers, afford a striking confirmation of its correctness. On this point it is needless to enlarge. We will simply quote a few examples of the use of the term *presbyter* as the designation of the office of government in the Church.

Clement, of Rome,* in his Epistle to the Corinthians, says: "It is

* Clement became Bishop of Rome near the close of the first century, and died about the year 100.

a shame, my beloved, yea, a very great shame, and unworthy of your Christian profession, to hear that the most firm and ancient Church of the Corinthians should, by *one* or *two* persons, be led into a *sedition against its presbyters*. Only let the flock of Christ be at peace with the *presbyters* that are set over it." Again: "Do ye, therefore, who laid the foundation of this sedition, *submit yourselves to your presbyters*, for ye did without respect, and walked accordingly to the law of God, *being subject to those who had the rule over you*."

Hermas, in his "Pastor,"* speaks of "the elders who preside in the Church," and again, of "the bishops, that is, presidents of the Churches." Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, in his letter to the Philippians, written in the forepart of the second century, enjoins upon them to be "subject to the presbyter"; and exhorts "the presbyter" to be "compassionate and merciful, abstaining from all wrath, respect of persons and unrighteous judgment; nor easy to believe any thing against any; nor severe in judgment."

* Hermas is supposed to be the one mentioned in Rom. xvi, 14.

LITERARY NOTICES.

- 1.—*The Louisville Debate: A Discussion of the question, What is Christian Baptism? including its proper subjects and design, between ELDER L. B. WILKES, of the Christian Church, Lexington, Ky., and REV. JACOB DITZLER, of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, Louisville, Ky.; held in Weisiger Hall, Louisville, Ky.; beginning on the 13th and closing on the 23d of December, 1870. Reported by BENN PITMAN, FRANCIS R. SPRAGUE, and MORRIS E. JONES. Lexington, Ky.: J. D. Trapp, of the "Apostolic Times," Publisher, 1871. 8vo. pp. 708.*

THE wise man has said, that "of making many books there is no end"; and as it is by no means certain that Debates are excluded from his catalogue, we may just as well make up our minds to the fact that such volumes as the "Louisville Debate" will continue to be published. Moreover, we suppose there are not a few good, earnest people who imagine that this kind of literature is of the very greatest value in assisting the Disciples of Jesus to "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." With this class of people we certainly have no desire to hold any controversy. We shall, therefore, allow, for the *sake of peace*, that such publications are not without value to people who have a taste for them; but we are wholly unable to see what use such works can be to the general public. Debates may be well enough sometimes. Insolent skeptics and boastful sectarians need not be allowed to go on forever in their opposition to truth. Hence it may be necessary now and then to break their *local* influence by meeting them in open controversy. But such discussions have little more than a *local* interest, and as such will scarcely command the attention of people generally. Their publication should not be thought of.

But it will be claimed for the volume before us that it does not belong to the character of Debates we have described—that it is on subjects of general interest—that it was conducted by two able men fairly representing the talent and learning of their respective Churches—and that the debate was held in a city away from the local causes which gave rise to it. All this may be readily granted; there are, however, other things which should be considered along with these. But as the Debate is already published, it is quite useless, except so far as future action is concerned, to discuss that matter now. Hence we will confine what we have to say to an examination of the ponderous volume which lies before us.

The merest glance through the work will reveal the fact that it contains more than the usual amount of quotations from languages that very few read, and that nobody cares any thing about. We do not charge the disputants with an attempt to "darken counsel," but, to put it in the mildest form, we think they have been guilty of an indiscretion that will render their work comparatively useless to almost every class of readers. Why men should think it worth while before a popular audience to engage in such linguistic gymnastics we can not understand. The good people of Louisville must have been highly entertained and immeasurably benefited by these lectures on Syriac, Chaldee, Coptic, Hebrew, Latin, Greek, etc. But the absurdity of introducing such matters is only made more manifest when we consider, what every scholar knows to be a fact, that more than half of this pedantic exhibition has nothing whatever to do in settling the Baptismal controversy. It is easy enough to get up a sort of pyrotechnic display of words, but when these words are to shine forth in the splendid light of a noonday sun, they are likely to cut a sorry figure in the illuminating business. And yet this is just the kind of entertainment to which the reader of this Debate is invited. It ought to be said, however, in justice to Mr. Wilkes, that he is not *directly* responsible for this feature of the discussion. We say directly, for *indirectly* he is responsible for it. He ought never to have consented to hold a Debate with a man whose chief recommendation is that he possesses the audacity to stand up in an age like this and attempt to settle as grave questions as are discussed in this Debate, by bewildering the mind with irrelevant quotations from languages, whose only possible use could be to reveal the disgusting pedantry of the speaker.

That Mr. Ditzler knows very little of the languages of which he makes such free use is so apparent as to excite the utmost contempt for his pretensions. Nor should it be said that Mr. Wilkes is any better off in this respect, except that his modesty commands our respect for him. In fact, neither of the disputants is sufficiently versed in the languages in which the Debate was chiefly held to justify the publication of their criticisms to the world. It is only when *masters* of these languages give us the results of their investigations that the world is benefited. It is easy enough, nowadays, for almost any one to hunt up a few leading words of Syriac, etc., and make those believe, who do not know any better, that he is a wonderful scholar. But such pretensions will not remain long uncovered in a volume like the one before us. We have already intimated that the Debate is chiefly written in the dead languages. But this remark should receive a little further qualification. It is evident that an *attempt* is made to use the *English*, whenever that unworthy tongue can be employed without materially letting down the dignity of the Debate. How far this attempt

is successful can only be known to those who will take the trouble to hunt up the English paragraphs and carefully analyze them. To show that we are not disposed to deal unfairly in this matter, we will quote the first sentence in the first speech of the Debate. Mr. Ditzler says:

"We appear in your presence this morning to discuss a question that necessarily involves the great and fundamental principles of religion—to determine the mode of baptism—a question that will come up for discussion hereafter; writers have reviewed the literature, profane and sacred, of two thousand years, and all for the purpose of trying to determine the meaning of one single word."

Now this may be some one of the numerous languages with which Mr. Ditzler claims to be acquainted, but certainly it is not *English*. We quote also the first sentence from Mr. Ditzler's seventh speech, on the first proposition. He says:

"I will simply remark, while I think of it, that I explained to you, at the outset of this debate, that the language of our Discipline, in reference to baptism, means, that it is the outward act by which we, on our part, recognize the relation that Heaven, by his legislation, in accordance with his plan of baptism, gives infants in the kingdom of Christ."

We have not selected these sentences because they are the most striking in the book. We could fill a hundred pages of the *Quarterly* with quotations illustrating nearly every kind of false syntax. The truth is, a strictly grammatical sentence is the exception, not the general rule.

There is one peculiarity of Mr. Ditzler's attempts at English that is worthy of special mention. When referring to the Disciples, he almost invariably uses the pronoun "*they*," without its proper antecedent. We suppose that this habit was formed under the restraining influence of the moderators. He did not wish to dignify Mr. Wilkes's brethren by calling them Disciples, or Christians; and as he was not allowed by the moderators to call them "Campbellites," the name which he was in the habit of applying to them, he concluded to call them by the euphonious and perspicuous name of "*they*." We hope "*they*" will appreciate Mr. Ditzler's delicacy on this subject.

Mr. Wilkes's English is much better than Mr. Ditzler's, though this, in many places, might be somewhat improved, especially the rhetoric. His language is generally courteous, his statements remarkably concise and clear, and his arguments compact and in their proper logical order. But we do not choose to speak further in reference to style.

The matter of the Debate presents very little that is new. With the exception of quotations from a few late authorities, neither one of the propositions is either so thoroughly or ably discussed as in the "Campbell and Rice Debate." True, there is an overstrained effort at erudition, and an immense amount of useless material thrown into the discussion. But this neither adds to the interest of the Debate, nor to that which determines

any question involved in the controversy. Mr. Ditzler's pedantic use of Syriac ought to have been simply ridiculed, instead of treated in a serious manner. It is amazing that this wonderful argument, on which he relies so much, should have heretofore cut so little figure in the Baptismal controversy. But if we are to treat the matter seriously at all, we must accept, in solemn silence, the fact that the Rev. Jacob Ditzler, who can neither write nor speak the *English language* correctly, has dug so far into Syriac as to be able to bring from its classic mines the only word that is capable of yielding the *pure* meaning of the great commission. *Credat Judeus Apella, non ego.*

There are many things that we would like to notice did our space permit. One thing we can not pass. Mr. Ditzler has a habit of misquoting authors; and, what is worse, he misquotes the Scriptures. We give one example: On page 362 he is attempting to show that faith alone is the condition of pardon, and he refers to Acts x, 43. The verse reads as follows: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Mr. Ditzler has it: "To him give all the prophets witness, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life." Now it is not so much the mixing of verses to which we object, but it is the suppression of the phrase, "*through his name*," that makes Mr. Ditzler's object apparent. Is it possible to treat a book, containing such perversions of the Word of God, in a manner to justify the charge of severity? But if any one shall say this is an exceptional case, we stand ready to produce many other perversions that are even more objectionable.

We need not say to the readers of the *Quarterly*, that in our judgment of books we have always tried to be charitable. We try to deal candidly with authors; but at the same time we take no pleasure in pointing out the imperfections in their works. When, however, a Debate is put forth with such *pretensions* as this one is, it becomes the duty of the critic to deal honestly with the public, though some of the laurels should be plucked from the brows of the brave knights who were engaged in the contest.

-
- 2.—*The Holy Bible*, according to the authorized version, (A. D. 1611,) with an explanatory and critical Commentary, and a revision of the translation. By Bishops and other Clergy of the Anglican Church. Edited by F. C. COOK, M. A., *Canon of Exeter*. Vol. I. Part I. Genesis—Exodus. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1871. Royal octavo. pp. 928.

THIS volume, which has been anxiously looked for by Bible students, will more than satisfy the public expectation. It is difficult to conceive how the work could be materially improved. The plan is simple, but is quite sufficient for all practical purposes. All extraneous matter is rigidly excluded from that portion of the work where the Text is consecutively treated. This

part is made as concise as possible, and yet the style is remarkable for clearness and comprehensiveness. Whatever requires a fuller discussion is ably treated in separate essays, and these are found in their proper places throughout the work. The notes are generally fully up to the most approved and recent scholarship, though there is no such parade of learning as will render them useless to the common reader. The Essays, which are intended for scholars, will be found quite satisfactory. The chief object of all the writers seems to have been to get at the meaning of the Text in the shortest possible way, and thus give a large amount of information in comparatively very little space.

The work is eminently practical. The writers seem to have studiously avoided mere theorizing. And yet they do not fail to meet such questions as seem to call for candid examination. Historical, Chronological, Geographical, and even Geological difficulties are fairly discussed, and the conclusions, we think, will generally be accepted.

Should the volumes which are to follow be equal to this, it is evident that the "Speakers' Commentary," as it is popularly called, will soon take the place of all others for general use.

As a specimen of the style of the work, and, at the same time, as giving a sharp rebuke to Darwinism, we quote the following "Note" "On the Immediate Creation and Primitive State of Man:"

"On the question of man's direct creation in distinction to the hypothesis of development, and on his original position as a civilized being, not as a wild barbarian, we may remark: 1. It is admitted, even by the theorists themselves, that in the present state of the evidence the records beneath the earth's surface give no support to the hypothesis that every species grew out of some species less perfect before it. There is not an unbroken chain of continuity. At times, new and strange forms suddenly appear upon the stage of life, with no previous intimation of their coming. 2. In those creatures, in which instinct seems most fully developed, it is impossible that it should have grown by cultivation and successive inheritance. In no animal is it more observable than in the bee; but the working bee only has the remarkable instinct of building and honey-making so peculiar to its race; it does not inherit that instinct from its parents—for neither the drone nor the queen-bee builds or works; it does not hand it down to posterity, for itself is sterile and childless. Mr. Darwin has not succeeded in replying to this argument. 3. Civilization, as far as all experience goes, has always been learned from without. No extremely barbarous nation has ever yet been found capable of initiating civilization. Retrogression is rapid, but progress unknown, till the first steps have been taught. (See Archbishop Whately, 'Origin of Civilization,' the argument of which has not been refuted by Sir John Lubbock, 'Prehistoric Man.' Both have been ably reviewed by the Duke of Argyll, 'Primeval Man.') Moreover, almost all barbarous races, if not wholly without tradition, believe themselves to have been once in a more civilized state, to have come from a more favored land, to have descended from ancestors more enlightened and powerful than themselves. 4. Though it has been asserted, without any proof, that man, when greatly degenerate, reverts to the type of the monkey, just as domesticated animals revert to the wild type, yet the analogy is imperfect and untrue. Man, undoubtedly, apart from ennobling influences, degenerates, and, losing more and more of the image of his Maker, becomes more closely assimilated to the brute creation, the earthly nature overpowering the spiritual. But that this is not natural to him is shown by the fact, that, under such conditions of degeneracy, the race gradually becomes

enfeebled, and at length dies out; whereas the domesticated animal, which reverts to the type of the wild animal, instead of fading away, becomes only the more powerful and the more prolific. The wild state is natural to the brutes, but the civilized is natural to man.

"Even if the other part of the Darwinian hypothesis were demonstrable, there is not a vestige of evidence that there ever existed any beast intermediate between apes and men. Apes, too, are by no means the nearest to us in intelligence or moral sense, or in their food and other habits. It also deserves to be borne in mind, that even if it could be made probable that man is only an improved ape, no physiological reason can touch the question, Whether God did not, when the improvement reached the right point, breathe into him 'a living soul,' 'a spirit,' 'which goeth upward' when bodily life ceases. This at least would have constituted Adam a new creature, and the fountain-head of a new race."

3.—*Systematic Theology*. By CHARLES HODGE, D. D., *Professor in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey*. Vol. I. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.; London and Edinburgh: T. Nelson & Sons. 1872. Royal 8vo. pp. 648.

THIS work is worthy of a much more extended notice than our space will permit at present. In fact, it is one of the most thoroughly studied works that has appeared during the year from an American author. It is by far the most important of Dr. Hodge's works. The distinguished Princeton Professor has put into it his most mature thought. And if there is, what is generally admitted, a peculiar theology taught in Princeton, we have it here presented as ably as it can be done by any one.

The substance of this volume has been presented again and again to the students of Princeton Theological Seminary. Hence Dr. Hodge has had ample opportunity to rewrite at every point where he thought it necessary to do so; and what is now written may be accepted as his final conclusions in reference to all the subjects discussed. It may therefore be properly styled the *magnum opus* of the venerable theologian.

While we are not prepared to accept many of its conclusions, we do not hesitate to commend the work to all who love close, logical reasoning, a profound reverence for truth, and high scholarly attainment. As a somewhat new setting of old truths, and as containing a clear, satisfactory statement of the theological position of Presbyterianism in the United States, it is not excelled by any other work known to us.

The following will give the reader some idea of the contents of the first volume: 1. INTRODUCTION, containing six chapters respectively on Method, Theology, Rationalism, Mysticism, Roman Catholic Doctrine Concerning the Rule of Faith, and the Protestant Rule of Faith. 2. THEOLOGY PROPER, containing thirteen chapters on The Origin of the Idea of God, Theism, Anti-theistic Theories, Knowledge of God, The Nature and Attributes of God, The Trinity, The Divinity of Christ, The Holy Spirit, The Decrees of God, Creation, Providence, Miracles and Angels.

The chapters on the "Roman Catholic Doctrine Concerning the Rule

of Faith," and "The Protestant Rule of Faith," are very able, and will doubtless attract considerable attention at this particular time. The discussion of the "Trinity" and "Decrees of God" presents nothing new on these subjects. Nevertheless, the old orthodox theories are maintained with considerable force. The chapter on the "Holy Spirit" is much less objectionable than we had supposed it would be; still some expressions, such as that the Holy Spirit is "presented in the Scriptures as the proper object of worship," etc., may be fairly questioned.

The following extract, showing that "Materialism is inconsistent with the Facts of Experience," will serve to give our readers a taste of Dr. Hodge's quality:

"It is generally admitted that in Nature, *i. e.*, in the external world, there are four distinct spheres, or, as they are sometimes called, planes of existence. First, the common chemical compounds, which constitute the mineral kingdom; second, the vegetable kingdom; third, the irrational animal world; and fourth, man. It is admitted that all the resources of science are incompetent to raise matter from one of these planes to another. The plant contains ingredients derived from the mineral kingdom, with something specifically different. The lifeless elements of the mineral kingdom, under 'the influence of pre-existent living matter,' and not otherwise, become living and life-supporting matter in the plant. The products of vegetable life, in like manner, become the matter of animal tissues and organs, but only under the influence of pre-existing living animal tissues. So also the products of the vegetable and animal kingdoms are received into the human system, and become connected with the functions and phenomena of the intellectual and moral life of man, but never otherwise than in the person of a man. This outstanding fact, vouched for by the whole history of our globe, proves that there is something in the plant which is not in lifeless matter; something in the animal which is not in the plant, and something in man which is not in the animal. To assume, with the Materialist, that the organizing life of the plant comes out of lifeless matter; that the sensitive and voluntary life of the plant comes out of the insensible and involuntary life of the plant; or that the rational, moral, and spiritual life of man comes out of the constituents of the animal, is to assume as a fact something which all experience contradicts. We are not forgetful of the theories which refer these different grades or orders of existence to some process of natural development. We here, however, refer only to the outstanding fact of history, that, in the sphere of human experience, lifeless matter does not become organizing and living, in virtue of its own physical forces, nor the plant an animal, nor the animal a man, from any thing in the plant or animal, but only in virtue of an *ab extra* vital influence. It is indeed said, that as the same chemical elements combined in one way have certain properties, and when combined in another way have other properties, so the same elements combined in one way in lifeless matter, and in other ways in plants, animals, and man, may account for all their distinctive characteristics. But it is to be remembered that the properties of chemical compounds, however varied, are chemical, and nothing more; whereas, in vital organisms, the properties or phenomena are specifically different from mere chemical effects. They have no relation to each other, any more than gravity to beauty; and, therefore, the one can not account for the other."

- 4.—*The Problem of Evil*: Translated from the French of M. Ernest Naville, author of "La vie Eternelle," "La Pere Celeste," "Maine de Biran, sa Vie et ses Pensees," etc. By JOHN P. LACROIX, Professor in the Ohio Wesleyan University, and Translator of Pressensé's "Reign of Terror." The only authorized translation. New York: Carlton & Lanahan; San Francisco: E. Thomas; Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871. 12mo. pp. 323.

No one will doubt that there are difficulties in the discussion of such questions as are considered in this volume. The problem of evil presents at once what Edward Beecher has aptly styled "The Conflict of Ages," and it is scarcely probable that any new solution will help matters very much. Still, every earnest contribution to an investigation which has absorbed the minds of some of the greatest thinkers of the past should be hailed with pleasure by all who have an interest in this profoundest of theological subjects. That the present volume is worthy to be placed among the best of its kind will not be doubted by any one who will carefully read it.

The author opens his discussion by a definition of the good. This he regards as necessary to a proper understanding of evil. Good is defined as "*that which ought to be*," and evil "*that which ought not to be*;" and then what is essential to respectively determine these occupies mainly the discussion to the conclusion of the second lecture. The third lecture presents the "problem," which is declared to be the precise origin or cause of evil. Then follows a consideration of the solutions that have been given to the problem. In the fourth lecture we have the author's own solution, which is presented in the following words:

"Humanity is corrupted because it has corrupted itself. A primitive act of humanity has, by an abuse of free-will, by a revolt against law, created the evil heart of humanity. From this it follows, that in each individual two things are to be distinguished: first, his personal will, which is responsible for his acts, and for his consent to the inclination of nature; secondly, the human nature which is in him, and for which he is responsible on his part, not as an individual, but in his quality of human being. There are here two affirmations which must be maintained with equal force—the collective responsibility of humanity, and the individual responsibility of each of its members. These affirmations do not contradict, but simply limit and complement each other. While the nature of the problem will require me to insist on the collective responsibility of the race, it is essential to guard intact the responsibility of the individual. We will be careful not to imitate Luther's drunken peasant, who, in his effort to ride upright, no sooner righted himself up from one side than he found himself veering to the other, without finding his proper equilibrium."

The author claims, that in order to the acceptance, or even comprehension of his solution, it is "necessary to consider humanity as not only a collection of human beings—a numerical mass—but as a real existence, distinct from individuals, without, however, being separate from them, and which may be the object of moral imputation." The fifth lecture gives the proof, and meets the difficulties in the way of the author's solution. The

two succeeding lectures treat of "The Conflict of Life" and "The Source of Strength."

Notwithstanding the nature of the question discussed, the treatment is eminently popular. The lectures were first delivered at Geneva, and afterward at Lausanne, during the Winter of 1867-1868, under the title of *A Philosophical Discussion*. They attracted large audiences at the time of their delivery, and excited a very general interest in the question discussed. We are thankful to the translator for the very elegant English dress in which they now appear.

5.—*The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ, and its relation to the Principles and Practice of Christianity.* By WILLIAM STROUD, M. D.; with a letter on the subject by SIR JAMES Y. SIMPSON, Bart., M. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 549 & 551 Broadway. 1871.

WE do not think that the question discussed in this volume is of much practical value. It belongs to that class of subjects more curious than profitable. Still it can not be denied that Dr. Stroud's volume is intensely interesting. This arises partly from the novelty of the subject, and partly from the amount of interesting and valuable information it contains. The book is truly an able treatise, and is written with a reverent spirit, in the interest of the Christian religion.

The following able summary is given in the Introduction, by Sir James Y. Simpson, himself an eminent physician:

"I. His death was not the mere result of crucifixion; for, 1. The period was too short; a person in the prime of life, as Christ was, not dying from this mode of mortal punishment in six hours, as he did, but usually surviving till the second or third day, or even longer. 2. The attendant phenomena, at the time of actual death, were different from those of crucifixion. The crucified died, as is well known, under a lingering process of gradual exhaustion, weakness and faintness. On the contrary, Christ cried with a loud voice, and spoke once and again, all apparently within a few minutes of his dissolution.

"II. No known injury, lesion or disease of the brain, lungs, or other vital organs could, I believe, account for such a sudden termination of his sufferings in death, except (1) arrestment of the action of the heart by fatal fainting or syncope; or (2) rupture of the walls of the heart, or larger blood-vessels issuing from it.

"III. The attendant symptoms—particularly the loud cry and subsequent exclamations—show that death was not the effect of mortal fainting or mere fatal arrestment of the action of the heart by syncope.

"IV. On the other hand, these symptoms were such as to have been seen in cases of rupture of the walls of the heart. Thus, in the latest book published in the English language on diseases of the heart, the eminent author, Dr. Walshe, Professor of Medicine in University College, London, when treating of the symptoms indicating death by rupture of the heart, observes: 'The hand is carried to the front of the chest, a piercing shriek uttered,' etc. The rapidity of the resulting death is regulated by the size and shape of the ruptured opening. But usually death very speedily ensues, in consequence of the blood escaping from the interior of the heart into the cavity of the large surrounding heart-sac or pericardium, which sac has, in cases of rupture of the heart, been found, on dissection, to contain sometimes two, three, four or more pounds of blood accumulated within it, and

separated into red clot and limpid serum or 'blood and water,' as is seen in blood when collected out of the body in a cup or basin in the operation of common blood-letting.

"V. No medical jurist would, in a court of law, venture to assert, from the mere symptoms preceding death, that a person had certainly died of rupture of the heart. To obtain positive *proof* that rupture of the heart was the cause of death, *post-mortem* examination of the chest would be necessary. In ancient times such dissections were not practiced. But the details left regarding Christ's death are most strikingly peculiar in this respect: that they offer us the result of a very rude dissection, as it were, by the gash made in his side after death by the thrust of the Roman soldier's spear. The effect of that wounding or piercing of the side was an escape of 'blood and water,'

VISIBLE TO THE APOSTLE JOHN,

standing some distance off; and I do not believe that any thing could possibly account for this appearance, as described by that Apostle, except a collection of blood effused into the distended sac of the pericardium in consequence of rupture of the heart, and afterward separated, as is usual with extravasated blood into those two parts, viz.: (1) crassamentum or red clot, and (2) watery serum. The subsequent puncture from below of the distended pericardial sac would most certainly, under such circumstances, lead to the immediate ejection and escape of its sanguineous contents, in the form of red clots of blood and a stream of watery serum, exactly corresponding to that description given in the sacred narrative, 'and forthwith came there out blood *and* water'—an appearance which no other natural event or mode of death can explain or account for.

"VI. Mental emotions and passions are well known by all to affect the action of the heart in the way of palpitation, fainting, etc. That these emotions and passions, when in overwhelming excess, occasionally, though rarely, produce laceration or rupture of the walls of the heart, is stated by most medical authorities who have written on the affections of this organ; and our poets even allude to this effect as an established fact:

'The grief that does not speak
Whispers the o'er-fraught heart, and bids it break.'

But if ever a human heart was riven and ruptured by the mere amount of mental agony that was endured, it would surely—we might even argue *a priori*—be that of our Redeemer, when, during these dark and dreadful hours on the cross, he, 'being made a curse for us,' 'bore our griefs and carried our sorrows,' and suffered for sin the malediction of God and man, 'full of anguish,' and now 'exceedingly sorrowful, even unto death.'

"There are theological as well as medical arguments in favor of the opinion that Christ in reality died from a ruptured or broken heart. You know them infinitely better than I do. But let me merely observe that:

"VII. If the various wondrous prophecies and minute predictions in Psalm xxii and lxi, regarding the circumstances connected with Christ's death, be justly held as literally true, such as, 'They pierced my hands and my feet,' 'They parted my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture,' etc., why should we regard as merely metaphorical, and not as literally true also, the declarations in the same Psalms, 'Reproach hath broken my heart,' 'My heart is like wax; it is melted in the midst of my bowels?' And

"VIII. Death by mere crucifixion is not a form of death in which there was much, if indeed any, shedding of blood. Punctured wounds do not generally bleed; and the nails, besides being driven through parts that were not provided with large blood-vessels, necessarily remain, plugging up the openings made by their passage. The whole language and types of Scriptures, however, involve the idea that the atonement for our sins was obtained by the *blood* of Christ, shed for us during his death on the cross. 'Without shedding of blood there is no remission.' This shedding, however, was assuredly done in the fullest possible sense, under the view that the immediate cause of his dissolution was rupture of the heart, and the consequent fatal escape of his heart and life-blood from the central system of the circulation."

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Christliche Klänge aus den Griechischen und Römischen Klassikern. Eine Sammlung aus den Quellen im Anschluss an den Catechismus und die bezüglichen Bibelsprüche fuer Gebildete und höhere Lehranstalten, insbesondere Gymnasien, von R. SCHNEIDER, Professor am Gymn. Bernhard. zu Meiningen.* (Christian Tones from the Greek and Roman Classics. Collected from the sources and arranged together with the Biblical passages in the order of the Catechism, for the use of Educated Persons and of Higher Schools, particularly of Gymnasia, by R. SCHNEIDER, Professor in the Bernhardine Gymnasium at Meiningen.) Gotha, 1865. 8vo. pp. lxvi, 376.
- Logos Spermatikos. Parallelstellen zum Neuen Testament aus den Schriften der alten Griechen. Ein Beitrag zur Christlichen Apologetik und zur vergleichenden Religionsforschung, von EDMUND SPIESS, Doctor der Philosophie, Licentiat und Privatdocent der Theologie an der Universität Jena.* (Logos Spermatikos. Parallel Passages to the New Testament, from the writings of the Ancient Greeks. A Contribution to Christian Apologetics, and to the Comparative Investigation of Religion. By EDMUND SPIESS, Doctor of Philosophy, Licentiate and Private Lecturer in Theology at the University of Jena.) Leipzig, 1871. Large 8vo. pp. lxiii, 505.

THE comparative study of religion is becoming of more and more importance every day, and the most natural suggestion, from the Christian point of view, is that the cultivation of this branch of modern investigation ought not to be left to those whose interest therein is mainly philological or historical. It is well known that the Christian believer is very frequently met with the objection that Christianity contains no new principle of permanent historical value, that every thing really valuable in the Christian religion has been enunciated time and again in connection with other religions which are nowise dependent on this. Now, for the believer simply to throw up his hands in holy horror at the audacity of such assertions, and to turn away in sorrow and disgust at the infidelity of him who makes them, are signs not of weakness of character only, but of faith. It may be very true that it is of "no use to fight the devil with fire," but it is none the less true that, in the conflict with modern science, Christianity must use the weapons of science or be ignominiously beaten. Furthermore, in order to use them effectively, Christians must learn how to handle them.

To this end it is necessary that they should undergo special training; and in order to give this training, the comparative study of religion must be a part of the regular theological curriculum.

The long introduction to Professor Spiess's work is devoted mainly to the consideration of the necessity and practicability of such a discipline.

What he says is well considered, and stated with ability and moderation. His argument is summed up in the following paragraphs:

"Comparison, the search for phenomena that regularly recur, and for common and necessary properties and occurrences, has long been comprehensively and methodically practiced in other departments, and, in the hands of properly qualified investigators, has proved to be the key which discloses and makes known surprising similarities, unexpected relationships, and hidden laws. We need only reflect what results have been brought to light by Comparative Anatomy, the Comparative Psychology of Nations, Comparative Philology, Comparative Statistics. A fresh spirit of investigation has penetrated all departments of knowledge through the application of the comparative method; and as science has made the buried structures of geological antiquity to rise again, and on them built its bold conclusions, so the comparative method puts life and motion into the fossils of historical knowledge, and into the tertiary strata of thought and language deposited by ages long gone by. This method must, some time or other, be thoroughly and systematically applied to the investigation of religion. . . . This Comparative Study of Religion would be divided into Comparative Exegesis, Comparative Dogmatics, Comparative Ethics, and the Comparative History of Religions, and would, of course, extend over a very wide field, the cultivation of which could only be gradual, but which ought in the future to be taken in hand at as many points as possible.

"Christian Theology sits apart, insulated; the mere study of the Holy Scriptures does not make it possible for her to orient herself concerning the relation of Christianity to the religions of the most various lands and times, and thus to comprehend their nature and their *raison d'être*. Occasionally, and by the way, it may be, a glance is cast at other religions, and the relation of Christianity to them investigated; but, on the whole, the theological faculties occupy themselves almost exclusively with the interpretation, history, and application of the Bible. They ought to expand their horizon, to enlarge their domain, to extend their investigation. The comparative study of religion is both their duty and their right. Let it not be objected that the cultivation of this science must be undertaken by Philosophy, for we do not plead for a speculative treatment of the Comparative Science of Religion, but for a theological investigation of religion by a comparison of the different religious Scriptures, and of the historical development of the religions that have appeared in all zones and periods of the world, with the doctrinal system and the history of Christianity. . . .

"He who knows only one language, knows none. 'With every additional language you learn, you liberate more and more the mind within you that has hitherto been bound,' says the poet (Rueckert). The same is true of religion; to an understanding of religion acquaintance with the religions is necessary. With every new religion, the essence of which is disclosed to you, whose relationship to the total moral and spiritual life of man you have recognized, your circle of vision expands, your visual power increases, and your judgment purifies itself from prejudices. This is the way to shake off the trammels of nationality, of confession, of the age and race to which you belong, and to rise to the cosmopolitan idea, the idea of the equality of all men before God, and of the divine sonship of all; in this way we must approach the completion of the kingdom of God, the fulfillment of the grand prophecy of one flock and one shepherd. (John x, 16.) But even if a man understood and spoke all languages, not one of them would become his mother-tongue; and even though he were to investigate all religions, not one of them could take the place of his mother-religion; though the foreign land be never so beautiful, it can not become one's native land. On the contrary, native land, the mother-tongue, the inherited faith, will gain in value; their excellences will appear for the first time in their true light when compared with foreign countries, foreign languages, foreign faiths. Our choice will not be doubtful even in cases where light and shadow are distributed alike on both sides; our heart will decide in favor of the paternal faith, of the language in which alone we can pray, of the country in which we were born, and in which we should wish to die and find our rest. But Christianity so powerfully demonstrates its pre-eminence over all other religions, and exer-

cises such a mighty attraction, that becoming acquainted with other religions threatens it with no danger, nor need it, therefore, ever fear comparison with them. If it were so situated as to dread and avoid competition with them, its prospect of conquering the world and enduring to the end of time would be poor indeed. But as Christianity, in order to stand every test, must be subject to the same critical process to which the historian subjects every other religion, so it can bear every comparison without misgiving. And even though it should be demonstrated that the same laws which operate with plastic energy in the development of dogma and cultus have prevailed in Christianity as in all other religions, we do not, nevertheless, for a moment, doubt that the kernel of it, its real essence, confers upon mankind something not only more perfect in degree than they, but also something that in its very nature is wholly new and absolutely good. What is new therein is at the same time that which is its characteristic mark, that which distinguishes the Christian religion from all the rest."

As contributions toward the comparative investigation of religion, both the works, whose titles are given above, were written. That by Professor Schneider is, in one respect, more satisfactory: it contains parallels drawn from Latin as well as from Greek authors. But the arrangement of the classical and the Biblical passages, under the different rubrics of the Lutheran Catechism, strikes us as exceedingly unfortunate. It would probably never have occurred to any one but a Lutheran dyed in the wool to make such a disposition of the materials. In the matter of arrangement, Professor Spiess has pursued the far simpler and wiser plan of placing his extracts from the Greek authors side by side with the passages of the New Testament in consecutive order. The latter he does not print *in extenso*, but simply refers to book, chapter, and verse.

To the ordinary reader, it is true, many of the parallels will seem somewhat far-fetched; indeed, the very nature of the work undertaken is such that the result is sure to leave a feeling of dissatisfaction in the mind of the reader. In regard to many of the sayings quoted in Professor Spiess's work, the author himself confesses that they are related more in sound than in sense to similar utterances in the Scriptures. The following paragraph will show that he is not unaware of the dangers attending his undertaking:

"In general, it not seldom happens to us that, both in the simple interpretation of a writer, and in the practical exegesis of a word, we put more into a passage than can be got out of it. The danger of translating and interpreting from one's own point of view, and not out of the soul of the author, is so great that scarcely a philologist—to say nothing of a theologian, whose very blood is mingled with Christian presuppositions—can escape it. A complete freedom from bias exists nowhere in reality; even the philosopher and the philologist always approach a book with certain, for them unquestionable, assumptions; they measure it by their standard, transfer, involuntarily and unconsciously, their modern metaphysical or ethical horizon, their thoughts, doubts, and desires, to the poor subject of their translation and elucidation, and thus falsify and torture the original sense."

These considerations, however, are by no means sufficiently weighty to prevent the author, himself a theologian, from attempting what he regards as almost impossible:

"Admitting that theologians are in a greater degree exposed to the danger of an exegesis, biased in some direction or other, an investigation and comparison like the present

belongs, nevertheless, to the domain of theological studies. For when the ancient classics are interpreted by philologists merely, according to grammatical and exegetical principles, their dogmatico-ethical contents will be just as little laid bare and properly estimated as if Hippocrates and Galen, or the Pandects and Digests, were to be explained by men of the grammar and lexicon. For our purpose, however, we are concerned with the exposition and demonstration of the material contents. In regard to the religious and ethical contents of a book, the theologian is the competent judge; we do not mean, of course, the theologian whose field is dogmatic theology, but the philosopher of religion. *Suum cuique* is the motto also in the domain of science."

This view of the case is the more justifiable from the fact that Professor Spiess writes not merely in the interest of science, but also of Christian apologetics, and more especially with a view to the needs of those who, through the influence of scientific and humanistic studies, have become estranged from Christian truth.

"These gentlemen," he says, "if they still have such a thing as a sensorium for truth and the needs of the mind, will be astonished to find in the Bible ideas and utterances which they have read with enthusiasm in their Canon, and to find them so much profounder and grander there than anywhere else—words with the visible evidence of a higher origin and the clear impress of divine descent. Would that they might for once weigh the matter, by test and comparison, (which our book is intended to make possible and to which it shows the way,) whether it be not worth while to set the pearls and precious stones of the Christian documents beside the gold and silver treasures of ancient heathenism. We venture to say that the word of the living God will stand the test, and need not be afraid of any competition. There are still more comforting 'Consolations' than those of Seneca or Plutarch! And what they do not believe from the Bible, when it speaks to us of God, of our divine kinship, of the immortality of the soul, and of our heavenly calling—when it speaks of the nothingness of earthly things, of the helplessness of man, of the power of evil, and of the just judgment to come upon all flesh—they will, perhaps, believe sooner and more willingly when they hear it confirmed out of the mouth of Euripides and Æschylus, Socrates and Aristotle, Xenophon and Thucydides, Pindar and Homer, Sophocles and Plato, and the whole chorus of the celebrated poets, orators, and thinkers of that classic country which they esteem more highly even than we Christians do the Promised Land with all its holy places."

But, notwithstanding these hopes there is another danger connected with the work to which the author is not blind. It is certainly possible to infer quite other things from the alleged harmony of Biblical and Classical writers concerning the essentials of Christian theology than those which tend to the corroboration of the Christian claim. It might be asserted that a particular supernatural revelation was unnecessary, and, therefore, inconceivable, inasmuch as man is able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth in the natural way. Even if we admit, it might be said, that the Scriptures furnish a higher degree of knowledge concerning eternal things, and that they afford a more perfect and a deeper insight into the invisible mysteries, this admission does not justify the inference that the revelation of God contained in the Holy Books must and could have taken place in a miraculous manner, and not in accordance with the laws immanent in the human mind. Nay, it might be asserted that this very *λόγος σπερματικός* is the proof that the natural right of reason is fully sufficient, and that man has, in his own mind and in the

innate ideas thereof, an adequate source and rule of faith and life. These objections the author himself raises for the purpose of refuting them. A considerable portion of his Introduction is devoted to this object. The pith of the argument is contained in the following:

"Many and great as are the things which the natural man has come to the knowledge of, one riddle he has never been able to solve; one answer he could never find; the question of all times; the painful longing of all hearts: 'How shall I get rid of my sins?' remained unsolved, unanswered. To this Christ first gave the answer, brought the message in regard to it, found the eternal solution. This is the center, the cardinal point; this revelation of the way to peace, of the miraculous redemption, of the reconciliation founded by the Father, and of our justification before God, is really the only essentially new thing which Christianity brought to mankind. This mystery, which even the angels desired to look into, (1 Peter i, 12,) never entered into the mind of mortal man, and is superior to all reason. There are three principal questions, mentioned by Nägelsbach in his 'Post-Homeric Theology,' which man asks of every religion: 'Is there a God, and what is he?' 'How can man get quit of his sin?' 'What becomes of him after death?' Concerning the first and the last of these questions, Paganism had presentiments more or less distinct, which led almost to the portal of the truth; in regard to these it had received rich *σπέρματα λόγου*. Christ brought certainty and clearness, and lifted human knowledge to the highest plane, by showing us God as eternal, all-embracing Love, and by transferring the center of gravity, as regards human destiny, to the other world, to a more perfect phase of personal existence. . . . Among the heathen there was a longing for and a reaching forward toward the light unknown to them, a hope and a desire for deliverance and consolation. But the decree of the Supreme for the redemption of sinful humanity was hidden from them; scarcely more than a few rays of light on this point had reached them. But there, where the *λόγος σπαρακτικός* can give no enlightenment, we must listen to the *λόγος ἑνωτικός*. To the anxious question, 'O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?' we have the answer, 'I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord!'"

We have said, and allowed the author to say, enough concerning the purpose and spirit of the second of the above-named works, to show that it is well worth the attention of scholars and students. The same is true of the work of Prof. Schneider, in spite of its defective arrangement.

2.—*Bibel-Lexicon. Realwörterbuch zum Handgebrauch fuer Geistliche und Gemeindeglieder. Herausgegeben von KIRCHENRATH PROF. DR. DANIEL SCHENKEL. Dritter Band.* (Bible Lexicon. A Practical Manual for the use of clergymen and laymen. Edited by PROF. DR. DANIEL SCHENKEL, Ecclesiastical Councillor. Vol. III.) Leipzig, 1871. 8vo. p. 629.

WE have before called attention to this work. The third volume is now before us with articles extending from *Heiligkeit Gottes* (Holiness of God) to *Kyrene* (Cyrene) some of them of very considerable importance, as giving the latest results of Rationalistic criticism on questions of great moment. Among these, we may particularly mention Prof. Holtzmann's article on the Apostle John, which is arranged under the following heads: 1. John in the Fourth Gospel; 2. John in the Synoptics; 3. John in Tradition; 4. John and Judaism; 5. The Writer of the Apocalypse and the Evangelist; 6. The Growth of the Ecclesiastical Idea concerning John. We know of no

work in which the whole question relating to John is reviewed, from the Rationalistic point of view, of course, with such precision and force, and with such complete mastery of the materials, as in the dozen pages of this brilliant and exhaustive article. In fact, the ability of the whole work is very marked. It is but just to acknowledge this, whatever may be our opinion of the conclusions to which the various writers come.

- 3.—*Erziehungsgeschichte in Skizzen und Bildern. Mit besonderer Ruecksicht auf das Volksschulwesen, fuer Lehrer, deren Bildner und Leiter, herausgegeben von DR. L. KELLNER. Zweite, verbesserte und vermehrte Auflage. Dritter Band.* (The History of Education in Sketches and Pictures. Edited, with particular reference to Primary Schools, for Teachers and their Instructors and Directors, by DR. L. KELLNER. Second, improved and enlarged edition. Vol. III.) Essen, 1871. 8vo. p. 220.

IT is a source of special and peculiar gratification to us to be able to call attention to meritorious works on education. There is no subject on which superior books in the English language are so scarce, and none on which they are more needed. We need them especially in this country; for, as we have already intimated, in a former number of the Quarterly, there is no question which will be likely to come before the American people for settlement during the next generation, that can compare in importance with the school question. It is really at the bottom of all other social and political questions. And in order to bring about a happy solution of the difficulties connected with it, there will be need of the greatest wisdom, 'impartiality,' and desire for the general good, on the part of all those who engage in the discussion of the matter before the people. Prejudice, ignorance, and selfishness could nowhere work greater evil than here. One of the most effective instruments of culture at the present juncture would be a first-class periodical, devoted exclusively to the discussion of educational topics, a periodical two of the principal features of which should be a department devoted to the reproduction in English of valuable articles selected from the best continental educational magazines, and a department of reviews of foreign educational literature. This would keep us *au courant* and *en rapport* with the best thought of our European contemporaries on this most vital subject. What has been done in this direction thus far is not worth mentioning. Indeed, taken in the bulk, our present periodical educational literature is, so far as we are acquainted with it, very poor stuff.

So far as Dr. Kellner's work is concerned, we should like especially to call the attention of Roman Catholic publishers in this country to it. We have seldom read a distinctively Roman Catholic book with so much interest. It is characterized by a breadth of sympathy and a real catholicity of judgment such as one rarely meets with in works that are published

permissu superiorum. It has also the merit of being the first work of the kind ever issued under the auspices of the Roman Church. There is nothing in it that is new to those acquainted with the history of education, or that can not be found in a score of Protestant writers on the same subject. But, assuming the Roman point of view, the whole tone and manner of treatment can not be too highly commended. The following paragraph, taken from the beginning of the author's discussion of Luther, may serve as a specimen:

"To those who were truly in earnest about the instruction and education of the youthful generation, and who had also taken hold of this important task with their whole soul, belonged Luther himself, first of all. Of course, his stand-point aims to vindicate itself every-where; but yet the merit of having really esteemed the office and function of a teacher of youth, and of wishing to have it regarded from a *religious* point of view, can not be denied him."

The volume before us completes the second, much improved edition of the work.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

I.—*Revue Chrétienne* (Christian Review, Nos. 1-9, January to September.) Paris, 1871.

WE are glad to be once more in regular receipt of this excellent monthly, and trust that its course will henceforth be uninterrupted. The publication was not resumed at the beginning of the year, but by means of double and triple numbers, the amount of matter has been made up. A notice to its readers contained in the first number will be very likely to interest ours. It is as follows:

"The *Revue Chrétienne* resumes publication after a long interruption, which is sufficiently explained by the circumstances through which we have passed. . . . We have nothing to say concerning the spirit which will animate us. The terrible events, into the midst of which we have been thrown, render the affirmation of the great Christian and liberal principles, which are the soul of this review, more important than ever. We shall strive to make it more and more commensurate with the loftiness of its mission. I* know of nothing more grand than to fight the fight of the Gospel and of liberty on the ravaged and riven soil of our unhappy country. The first number is in part composed of articles which were written previous to the war; the present time will receive much more attention in the following numbers. We are able to promise our readers a journal of the war and of the siege of Paris, together with studies on constitutional questions. The greatest care will be bestowed on our monthly chronicles of events."

Perhaps the most valuable thing in the first number is the conclusion of the *Etude* on Capital Punishment, by M. Ray, begun in the September number of last year. The closing paragraphs are as follows:

"But this noble idea has its born adversaries; it also has its warm defenders, the number of whom increases day by day. There is one beautiful thing about it: that it has not only conquered the masses, in whom the grand instincts of humanity have not been falsified

* M. Edouard de Pressensé, the editor of the review. [Ed. Q.]

by an artificial culture, and upon the virtue of whom rests in the last analysis the order and security of a country, but has also gathered around it, in formidable coalition, the most elevated minds in all classes of society. We might cite such kings as Louis Philippe, Oscar of Sweden, John of Saxony, and, confining ourselves to France, such poets as Lamartine and Victor Hugo, who are also kings in their own order of grandeur, such statesmen and juriconsults as the Prince de Broglie, Lucas, Franck, J. Simon, J. Favre, and finally, after all these, an executioner. The public is acquainted with the curious *Mémoires* of the terrible Sanson, in whose family in Paris are counted seven generations of executioners. Here is the conclusion at which he arrives: 'Would that before I die I could see a punishment disappear from our laws which the softening of our manners more and more rarely permits, a punishment which, in the midst of our civilization, is the last vestige of human sacrifices inherited from barbarism! Would that, in the near future, my readers might, on arriving at the end of this book, be able to say: "This is the last will and testament concerning the death-penalty left by the last executioner."' "

"Is France not as civilized as Sanson thought? Is she below the moral level of neighboring nations? The death-penalty has been completely abolished in Europe, in the following States: Portugal, Tuscany, San Marino, Moldo-Wallachia, Neuchâtel, Zürich, Oldenburg, Anhalt, Nassau, Bremen, Saxony; and in America, in Louisiana, Wisconsin, Michigan, Rhode Island, Indiana, and in the republics of Columbia and New Granada. It is partially abolished in Belgium; systematically commuted in the Netherlands; condemned in Germany, in spite of the sad recoil which has just taken place on this question in the Reichstag, and which is due to a purely political compromise. Finally, it has been powerfully shaken in France by the very frequent admission of extenuating circumstances, by the multiplication of pardons, by the growing exigencies of public opinion. The democratic party has inscribed the abolition thereof on its programme. Even its defenders make it only a question of opportunity. They abandon it in principle, and renew the Platonic resolution of the Convention without its extenuating circumstances. One of the freaks of Alphonse Karr has furnished them with their most popular argument: 'Let the assassins make the beginning!' as if society ought to regulate its conduct by that of assassins! Ah, I can conceive for it a more elevated type of morality. Is it not the common mother of both the good and the bad? It has duties to fulfill toward all its children, above all toward the most vile, for they are the most to be pitied. Let it turn full of indignation and of pity to the downcast criminal, lying chained at its feet; let it cast far from it the sword of vengeance; and instead of killing him in cold blood, in the name of a problematic utility and of imperfect justice, let it take this tone: 'I am bound to protect myself and to protect you from your perverted and dangerous instincts. You will be held captive, for your liberty is perilous to others and to yourself. You will have to work, for you are bound to repair, as far as possible, the damage which you have caused; but still you yourself, in perverting the moral life within you, have suffered the greatest injury, and for this reason, while I punish your crime, I shall not cease endeavoring to lift you up again. I shall surround your intelligence with light, I shall cause the moral life to beam upon your conscience, I shall attempt to melt the ice of your selfishness by the warmth of my love, and in sorrow and in hope shall wait. If some day the prodigal son, returned from his wanderings, wishes to re-enter the paternal home, my arms will be open to him. This will be for me the occasion of great joy; for my son was lost and is found, he was dead and is now alive.' In the name of mercy, in the name of right, in the name of utility even, which is inseparable from right, we shall demand without ceasing—the abolition of the punishment of death."

Another most excellent thing which the first number contains is a speech, reprinted from *Le Temps*, which M. de Pressensé delivered at the Conservatory on the 26th of December, 1870. It is a discussion of the theory of "public safety," in the name of which so many deeds of violence have been counseled, perpetrated, and defended. We commend this most wise utterance to the consideration of all those who appeal so thoughtlessly to this

principle at every real or fancied emergency. A single paragraph will show the drift of the whole :

"After all, what are we concerned about saving? The State—our country? But do you not see that, in the modern sense, the State has but a single mission, which is to be the protector of individual liberty, by every-where restraining violence and arbitrary actions. If you pretend to save it by causing it to fail in its essential mission, by counseling arbitrary proceedings, your 'reasons of State' are in flagrant contradiction with the reason for the existence of the State. You destroy the modern State in order to recuscitate the paternal and tyrannical government of ancient society."

The number for March and April contains an elaborate article on the antiquity of man, the object of which is to show that the recent assertions of scientific men on this subject are not substantiated by the results of scientific research thus far obtained. The following number is largely taken up with an article explaining the attitude of the French Protestants toward the German cause in the war of 1870. The August and September numbers bring two important articles by the editor on "the True Authority in Matters of Religion," the first of them bearing the caption, "Jesus Christ our Authority," and the second "Concerning the Authority of the Holy Scriptures."

2.—*Das ökumenische Concil vom Vatican, begonnen im Jahre 1869. Periodische Blätter zur Mittheilung und Besprechung der Gegenstände, welche sich auf die neueste allgemeine Kirchenversammlung beziehen. Herausgegeben von DR. M. JOS. SCHEEBEN, Professor am erzb. Priesterseminar zu Kæln. Dritter Band. 8tes Heft.* (The Œcumenical Council of the Vatican. Periodical papers for the communication and discussion of matters which relate to the recent general ecclesiastical Synod. Edited by DR. M. JOS. SCHEEBEN, Professor in the archiepiscopal Theological Seminary at Cologne. Vol. III. No. 8.) Ratisbon, New York, and Cincinnati, 1871.

THE most important thing in the current number of this Periodical, is "A Declaration of the Holy Father concerning the extension of Papal Infallibility." We give the whole document just as it stands:

"On the 20th of the month the Holy Father received in his throne-room a deputation from the Academy of the Catholic Religion, which had presented itself, under the lead of Cardinal Asquini, for the purpose of expressing in an address the feelings of profound veneration and gratitude awakened by a Pope who has done so much for the elevation and extension of the Catholic Church.

"In reply thereto the Holy Father encouraged the members of the Academy to defend the truth and to combat the errors which set themselves against it. Among the various tasks that offered themselves in this regard to them [the Academy], one seemed to him of especial importance, viz : that of refuting the assertions with which it is sought to falsify the conception of Papal infallibility. Among the other errors, more malicious than all the rest, (*Fragli altri errori, piu di tutti essere malizioso*), was that which maintained that it included the right to depose princes, and to absolve nations from their oath of fealty—a truly abominable confusion. This right had been exercised by the Popes a few times in cases of extreme necessity, but it had nothing whatever to do with Papal infallibility. The source of this right was not in the infallibility, but in the authority of the Pope. According

to the then valid public law, and to the unanimous desire of Christian nations, who acknowledged in the Pope the supreme judge of Christendom, this authority extended so far that the Popes were the judges over princes and certain nations, even in civil affairs (*civilmente*, as opposed to *spiritualmente*). But present relations were entirely different from those of former times, and nothing but malice could confound such different things and circumstances with each other, as if an infallible judgment concerning a truth of revelation had any connection whatever with a right which the Popes, called upon by the wishes of the nations, were obliged to exercise when the common welfare demanded. The motive which operates in the bringing forward of so absurd a proposition, which nobody thinks of, least of all the Pope, is very evident.

"Men seek for pretexts, even the most frivolous and false, on which to excite the princes against the Church. 'Some have desired,' the Holy Father continued, 'that I might explain myself farther and more definitely concerning the definition by the Council. I shall not do so. It is clear enough, and needs no further commentaries and explanations. For him who reads the decree with an upright mind its true sense is easy to discern. It is only your task to combat with your learning and acuteness these errors which deceive and ensnare and may lead the ignorant astray.'

"This declaration of the Holy Father is open and intelligible. In the face of it, all contrary assertions demonstrate themselves to be mere lies and calumnies.—*From the Voce della verita.*"

The above is one of those superficially fair and plausible and yet thoroughly dishonest declarations in which the history of modern Catholicism abounds. As a matter of fact, no Christian nation ever did unanimously appeal to the Pope as the supreme judge of Christendom to depose a reigning prince. It is a most flagrant falsehood to assert that such a thing ever occurred. No nation ever expressed to the Pope its unanimous desire to be released from its obligation to loyalty. Nor was there ever any Public Law, any Law of Nations, that recognized the jurisdiction of the Pope in such cases. Of course, it was impossible for Pope Pius to deny that many of his predecessors had acted as if they had the right to dethrone kings and to release nations from their oath of fidelity; and, therefore, a theory must be invented for the purpose of explaining and justifying their conduct. Not that there was any lack of such theories before; but the most of them had become a little shop-worn. Pius knows and says that the times have changed. He knows that a bull issued by him deposing any living prince would be greeted with the laughter of the civilized world; therefore, we shall probably not be treated to any exhibition of that sort of brute thunder. But the remarkable fact about this precious declaration is that His Holiness very studiously avoids saying the very thing which the world is given to understand he does say. He nowhere says that it is a gross mistake to suppose that the Pope has any such authority. He merely asserts that that has nothing whatever to do with his infallibility or the definition of it. The authority remains, so far as Rome is concerned, intact, only circumstances have changed, and it is not expedient to make any display of it.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Romanism as it is. An exposition of the Roman Catholic System, for the use of the American people; embracing a full account of its origin and development at Rome and from Rome, its distinctive features in theory and practice, its characteristic tendencies and aims, its statistical and moral position, and its special relations to American Institutions and Liberties. The whole drawn from Official and Authentic sources, and enriched with humorous illustrations, Documentary, Historical, Descriptive, Anecdotal, and Pictorial; together with a full and complete index. By REV. SAMUEL W. BARNUM, editor of the Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible. Hartford, Conn.: Connecticut Publishing Company. R. P. Nichols, Chicago, Ill. 1871. 8vo. pp. 753.

A Harmony of the four Gospels in Greek, according to the text of Tischendorf; with a Collation of the Textus Receptus and of the Texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles. By FREDERIC GARDINER, D. D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871. 8vo. pp. 268.

A Harmony of the four Gospels in English, according to the authorized version, corrected by the best Critical Editions of the Original. By FREDERIC GARDINER, D. D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School. Andover: Warren F. Draper. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George-street. 1871. 8vo. pp. 287.

The Life of Jesus, The Christ. By HENRY WARD BEECHER. "But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." (Gal. iv, 4, 5.) New York: J. B. Ford & Co. Edinburgh and London: Thomas Nelson & Sons. 1871. 8vo. pp. 510.

Commentary on the New Testament. Intended for Popular Use. By D. D. WHEDON, LL. D. Vol. III. Acts-Romans. New York: Carlton & Lanahan. San Francisco: E. Thomas. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden. 1871. 12mo. pp. 402.

Songs of the Sierras. By JOAQUIN MILLER. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1871. 12mo. pp. 299.

Walks about Jerusalem. A search after the Landmarks of Primitive Christianity. By ISAAC ERRETT. Cincinnati: R. W. Carroll & Co., Publishers. 1871. 16mo. pp. 211.

Dress and Care of the Feet. Showing their Natural Perfect Shape and Construction; their present Deformed Condition; and how Flat-Foot, Distorted Toes, and other Defects are to be Prevented or Corrected; with Directions for Dressing them Elegantly yet Comfortably; and Hints upon Various Matters relating to the General Subject. With Illustrations. New York: Samuel R. Wells, Publisher. 1871. 16mo. pp. 202.

Christianity and Positivism. A Series of Lectures to the Times on Natural Theology and Apologetics. Delivered in New York, January 16 to March 20, 1871, on the Ely Foundation of the Union Theological Seminary. By JAMES M'COSE, D. D., LL. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1871. 12mo. pp. 309.

Boston Lectures, 1871. Christianity and Skepticism: comprising a Treatment of Questions in Biblical Criticism. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society. 12mo. pp. 464.

The Portable Commentary. A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments. By the Rev. ROBERT JAMISSON, D. D., St. Paul's, Glasgow; Rev. A. B. FAUSSET, A. M., St. Cuthbert's, York; and the Rev. DAVID BROWN, D. D., Professor of Theology, Aberdeen. Boston: Gould and Lincoln. Two vols. pp. 777, 644.

History of Christian Councils. From the original Documents, to the close of the Council of Nicæa, A. D. 325. By CHARLES JOSEPH HEFELE, D. D., Bishop of Rattenburg, formerly Professor of Theology, in University of Tübingen. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871. 8vo. pp. 502.

History of Protestant Theology. Particularly in Germany. Viewed according to its Fundamental movements and in connection with the Religious, Moral, and Intellectual Life. By Dr. J. A. DÖRNER, Oberconsistorialrath and Professor of Theology at Berlin. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1871. Two vols. 8vo. pp. 444, 511.

EDITORS' TABLE.

THE QUARTERLY FOR 1872.—With the present number, the contract between the editor and publisher ceases by mutual consent, and the editor becomes solely responsible for the entire management of the Quarterly in the future.

All subscriptions should be addressed to the editor, instead of R. W. Carroll & Co., as heretofore.

The following appeal to the brotherhood explains itself. We hope its earnest words will not be without effect:

At a late conference with many brethren, we were requested to address the brotherhood in the interests of "The Christian Quarterly."

In compliance therewith we submit the following for the consideration of our brethren at large.

It is an almost universally conceded truth, that a religious body of people of whatever faith or practice, largely lay the foundation of whatever influence they may exert, as well as furnish a standard by which other religious bodies, and the world, will judge them, in the class of literature which they produce, and in the character of the periodicals which they publish. In view of this truth, it has always been the object of all bodies to furnish the best class of papers they can produce—edited by the best talent in their ranks. Our brethren have not been slow to understand this, and accordingly we already have among us veteran editors, who have raised up weekly and monthly papers of wide circulation and sterling merit, and have thus demonstrated the absolute necessity of maintaining our ground, by the liberal use of this powerful auxiliary—the press.

In addition to the influence thus gained, it was for a long time felt and acknowledged, that we needed also among us a periodical of a more solid character in many respects than our weeklies—one in which could be given to our contemporaries the maturer thoughts of our ablest men, and one that would be published at such intervals as to enable its contributors to devote all needed labor in the preparation of their articles, without being hurried for time or crowded for space.

In accordance with these oft-repeated and earnestly expressed wishes, brother W. T. Moore, associated with such men as W. K. Pendleton, Isaac Errett, and others, began the publication of "The Christian Quarterly." This paper is now closing its third year. To say that it has been a *success* in all respects pertaining to its literary character and religious influence, is indeed a very feeble expression. Volumes could be filled with favorable criticisms upon it; and the highest character of literary merit and soundness of Biblical interpretation have been assigned it by some of the best critics in America and Europe. It has, in a word, been declared equal to any, and superior to many of the Quarterlies of this country. From a people who were often sneeringly asked: Have you any literature? there was

born, in an hour as it were, a Quarterly, edited with scholarly ability and filled with matter exhibiting learning at once varied and profound.

There is one respect, however, in which the Christian Quarterly has failed to succeed in accordance with its merits; it has failed of that pecuniary support necessary to make it self-sustaining, and thereby become a permanency among us. To remedy this; to place it upon a self-sustaining basis; to assure our brotherhood of the permanent existence of a periodical worthy of themselves as a great people, and of the cause they plead; to continue to maintain the already enviable position and influence we have gained among our religious contemporaries; to still assert our position in the world of letters; to continue to present to many of the best minds of our age—through a channel which will command their attention, the teaching of Christ instead of the commandments of men—the idea of life in Christ instead of theological dogmas concerning Christ; to furnish for public libraries and reading rooms a work already welcomed to their shelves and tables—these are some among many reasons which might be urged in behalf of the necessity and propriety of at once coming to the support of the Christian Quarterly.

We therefore appeal to our entire brotherhood to seriously consider this matter, and without delay send in their subscriptions to the Quarterly. This is all that is asked. No donations are called for; no past deficits are asked to be made up; no funds as a bonus are wanted—simply and only that large subscription lists be at once made up and forwarded without delay. The Quarterly is now reduced to three dollars a year, and we confidently believe that no brother can make a more profitable investment of that amount of money. To our preachers the Quarterly will become almost a positive necessity, when they have acquainted themselves with the character of its contents and the field of its influence and usefulness. Once more let us beseech you, brethren, to take this matter in hand. Let every elder and preacher at once become an agent and send up to brother Moore all the subscribers he can possibly obtain. If this is done, the Quarterly will continue in its great and good work. If there is failure in this, the Quarterly must cease, or its burdens be borne by its editor alone.

Most cordially and fraternally your brethren in Christ,

C. L. LOOS,
O. A. BURGESS,
W. C. DAWSON,
A. I. HOBBS,

W. J. BARBEE,
A. S. HAYDEN,
W. H. HOPSON.

NO MORE DELAYS.—This number of the *Quarterly* has been unavoidably delayed. We expect in the future to have every number out on time.

B

